

v. 30 53



*The Department of State*

# bulletin

XXIX, No. 753

December 30, 1953



## THE CANADIAN-AMERICAN PARTNERSHIP:

Address by the President . . . . .	735
Text of Joint Communiqué . . . . .	738
Joint Economic Committee and Engineers' Board . . . . .	739

## THE MORAL INITIATIVE • Address by Secretary Dulles . . . . . 741

## THE IMPORTANCE OF U.S.-LATIN AMERICAN TRADE • by Assistant Secretary Cabot . . . . . 751

*For index see inside back cover*



# *The Department of State* bulletin

VOL. XXIX, No. 753 • PUBLICATION 5289

November 30, 1953

*The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.*

*Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.*

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents  
U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:  
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25  
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 22, 1952).

**Note:** Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

The C

Follo  
dent E  
Commo  
with a  
Preside  
rent, an  
of new  
bodies.

ADDRE

White Ho

Mes  
amis ca  
je fais  
m'expr  
fais-je  
d'expr  
mettre  
rectem  
estime.  
portan  
frères  
grand

[I i  
friends  
though  
slight  
ask you  
and in  
veying  
ments  
I salut  
gether  
made t  
Mr.

osity o  
me, I a  
Eisenh  
this cit  
zens, a  
especia  
this bo  
tinction  
Sinc  
leged,  
this be

On n

Novem

## The Canadian-American Partnership

*Following is the text of an address which President Eisenhower delivered before the House of Commons at Ottawa on November 14, together with a communique issued on the same date by the President and Prime Minister Louis S. St. Laurent, and documents relating to the establishment of new U. S.-Canadian engineering and economic bodies.*

### ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

White House press release dated November 14

*Mes salutations s'adressent également à mes amis canadiens qui parlent le français. Je sais que je fais preuve de grande témérité en essayant de m'exprimer, si peu soit-il, dans cette langue; aussi fais-je appel à votre indulgence pour les erreurs d'expression et de prononciation que je peux commettre en vous faisant part personnellement et directement de mes sentiments d'amitié et de haute estime. Je vous salue également pour la part importante que vous avez prise, de concert avec vos frères de langue anglaise, au développement de ce grand pays.*

[I include in my salutation my Canadian friends who speak the French language. Although I am more than bold to attempt even this slight venture into the speaking of that tongue, I ask your forgiveness for errors both in expression and in pronunciation as I take this means of conveying to you personally and directly my sentiments of friendship and high esteem. Likewise, I salute you for the great contribution you, together with your English-speaking brethren, have made to the growth of this great country.]

Mr. Prime Minister, for the very great generosity of the personal sentiments expressed toward me, I am humbly grateful. For the reception Mrs. Eisenhower and I experienced here throughout this city, we should like to extend to all your citizens, all your people, our very deep appreciation, especially for the honor of being received before this body. I assure you you have given us distinction that we shall never forget.

Since World War II, I have now been privileged, three times, to visit this great country and this beautiful city.

On my first visit, more than 7 years ago, I came

to express to the Canadian people a field commander's appreciation of their memorable contribution in the liberation of the Mediterranean and the European lands. On my second, I came to discuss with your governmental leaders your country's role in the building of Atlantic security. Both visits, in the warmth and spirit of a great people's welcome, were days that I shall remember all my life.

This day I again salute the men and women of Canada.

As I stand before you my thoughts go back to the days of global war. In that conflict, and then through the more recent savage and grievous Korean battles, the Canadian people have been valorous champions of freedom for mankind. Within the framework of NATO, in the construction of new patterns for international security, in the lengthy and often toilsome exploration of a regional alliance, they have been patient and wise devisers of a stout defense for the Western World. Canada, rich in natural gifts, far richer in human character and genius, has earned the gratitude and the affectionate respect of all who cherish freedom and seek peace.

I am highly honored by the invitation of the Parliament that I address it. For your invitation is rooted in the friendship, the sense of partnership, that for generations has been the hallmark of the relations between Canada and the United States. Your country, my country—each is a better and stronger and more influential nation because each can rely upon every resource of the other in days of crisis. Beyond this, each can work and grow and prosper with the other through years of quiet peace.

We, of our country, have long respected and admired Canada as a bulwark of the British Commonwealth and a leader among nations. As no Soviet wile or lure can divide the Commonwealth, nothing will corrupt the Canadian-American partnership.

We have a dramatic symbol of that partnership in the favored topic of every speaker addressing an audience made up of both our peoples, our unfortified frontier. But though this subject has become shopworn and well nigh exhausted as a feature of after dinner oratory, it is still a fact that our common frontier grows stronger every year, defended only by friendship. Its strength wells

from indestructible and enduring sources—identical ideals of family and school and church, and traditions which come to us from the common past.

Out of this partnership has evolved a progressive prosperity and a general well-being, mutually beneficial, that is without parallel on earth. In the years ahead, the pace of our mutual growth will surely be no less.

To strive, even dimly, to foresee the wonders of Canada's next generation is to summon the utmost powers of the imagination. This land is a mighty reservoir of resources. Across it, at this moment, there moves an extraordinary drama of enterprise and endeavor—Canadians, rapidly building basic industries, converting waters into hydroelectric energy, scrutinizing your soil for new wealth, pushing into the barrens of the North for minerals and for oil. You, of Canada, are building a magnificent record of achievement. My country rejoices in it.

More than friendship and partnership is significant in the relations between our countries. These relations that today enrich our peoples justify the faith of our fathers that men, given self-government, can dwell at peace among themselves, progressive in the development of their material wealth, quick to join in the defense of their spiritual community, ready to arbitrate differences that may rise to divide them. This Parliament is an illustrious symbol of a human craving, a human search, a human right to self-government.

All the free legislatures of the world speak for the free peoples of the world. In their deliberations and enactments, they mirror the ideas, the traditions, the fundamental philosophies of their respective nations.

On the other hand, every free nation, secure in its own economic and political stability, reflects the responsible leadership and the wise comprehension which its legislature has brought to the management of public affairs.

#### **A Laboratory of Self-Government**

Now, this continent uniquely has been a laboratory of self-government in which free legislatures have been an indispensable force. What is the result? It is a mighty unity built of values essentially spiritual.

This continent, of course, is a single physical and geographical entity. But physical unity, however, broken by territorial lines, fortress chains and trade barriers, is a characteristic of every continent. Here, however, independent and sovereign peoples have built a stage on which all the world can see:

*First:* Each country's patriotic dedication to its own enlightened self-interest but free from vicious nationalistic exploitation of grudge or ancient wrong.

*Second:* A joined recognition that neighbors,

among nations as among individuals, prosper best in neighborly cooperation, factually exemplified in daily life.

*Third:* An international will to cast out the bomb and the gun as arbiters and to exalt the joint search for truth and justice.

Here, on this continent, we present an example that other nations some day surely will recognize and apply in their relationships among themselves. My friends, may that day be close, because the only alternative, the bankruptcy of armament races and the suicide of nuclear war, cannot for long—must not for long—be tolerated by the human race.

Great has been our mutual progress. It fore-shadows what we together can accomplish for our mutual good.

Before us of Canada and the United States lies an immense panorama of opportunity in every field of human endeavor. A host of jobs to be done together confront us. Many of them cry for immediate attention. As we examine them together in the work days ahead, we must never allow the practical difficulties that impede progress to blind our eyes to the objectives established by principle and by logic.

With respect to some aspects of our future development, I hope I may, without presumption, make three observations.

The first is: The free world must come to recognize that trade barriers, although intended to protect a country's economy, often in fact shackle its prosperity. In the United States there is a growing recognition that free nations cannot expand their productivity and economic strength without a high level of international trade.

Now, in our case, yours and ours, our two economies are enmeshed intricately with the world economy. We cannot risk sudden dislocation in industry and agriculture and widespread unemployment and distress, by hasty decisions to accomplish suddenly what inevitably will come in an orderly economic evolution. "Make haste slowly" is a homely maxim with international validity.

Moreover, every common undertaking, however worthwhile it may be, must be understood in its origins, its application, its effects by the peoples of our two countries. Without this understanding it will have negligible chance of success. Canadians and citizens of the United States do not accept government by edict or decree. Informed and intelligent cooperation is, for us, the only source of enduring accomplishment.

To study further the whole subject of United States foreign economic policy, we have at home appointed a special commission with wide representation including members of the Congress as well as spokesmen for the general public. From the commission's studies will come, we hope, a policy which can command the support of the



American people and which will be in the best interest of the United States and the free world.

#### Joint U. S.-Canadian Projects

Toward the strengthening of commercial ties between Canada and the United States, officials of our two Governments have for some months been considering the establishment of a Joint Economic and Trade Committee. This Committee, now approved, will consist of Cabinet officers of both countries. They will meet periodically to discuss in broad terms economic and trade problems and the means for their equitable solution. I confidently believe that out of this process the best interests of both our countries will be more easily harmonized and advanced.

The second observation is this: Joint development and use of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes Waterway is inevitable. It is sure and certain. With you, I consider this measure a vital addition to our economic and national security. Of course, no proposal yet made is entirely free from faults of some sort. But every one of them can be corrected, given patience and cooperation.

In the United States my principal security advisers, comprising the National Security Council, favor the undertaking for national defense reasons. The Cabinet favors it on both security and economic grounds. A committee of the United States Senate has approved a measure authorizing it.

This measure provides for United States participation in a joint development by both countries. The proposal now awaits action by the United States Senate which, I am confident, will act favorably on it or some similar measure. The ways and means for assuring American cooperation in this great project will, I hope, be authorized and approved during the coming session of the Congress.

I have noted with satisfaction the New York Power Authority's acceptance of the Federal Power Commission's license. With this act the stage is set for a start on the St. Lawrence Power Project which will add materially to the economic strength of both countries.

My third observation is this: You of Canada and we of the United States can and will devise ways to protect our North America from any surprise attack by air. And we shall achieve the defense of our continent without whittling our pledges to Western Europe or forgetting our friends in the Pacific.

The basic threat of Communist purpose still exists. Indeed the latest Soviet communication to the Western World is truculent, if not arrogant, in tone.<sup>1</sup> In any event, our security plans must now take into account Soviet ability to em-

ploy atomic attack on North America, as well as on countries, friendly to us, lying closer to the borders of the U.S.S.R. Their atomic stockpile will, of course, increase in size, and means of delivery will increase as times goes on.

Now, each of our two nations seeks a secure home for realization of its destiny. Defense of our soil presents a challenge to both our peoples. It is a common task. Defensively, as well as geographically, we are joined beyond any possibility of separation. This element in our security problem is an accepted guide of the service leaders, Government officials, and legislatures on both sides of the border. In our approach to the problem we both realize that purest patriotism demands and promotes effective partnership. Thus we evolve joint agreements on all those measures we must jointly undertake to improve the effectiveness of our defenses, but every arrangement rests squarely on the sovereign nature of each of our two peoples.

#### Need for Vigilance

Canada and the United States are equal partners and neither dares to waste time. There is a time to be alert and a time to rest. These days demand ceaseless vigilance. We must be ready and prepared. The threat is present. The measures of defense have been thoroughly studied by official bodies of both countries. The Permanent Joint Board on Defense has worked assiduously and effectively on mutual problems. Now is the time for action on all agreed measures.

Steps to defend our continent are of course but one part of the worldwide security program. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, for example, is an essential defense of Ottawa, and of Washington, and of our neighbors to the South, as well as of communities thousands of miles to the eastward. Implicit in the consultations and detailed studies which must continue and in the defenses which we have already mounted is the need for worldwide vigilance and strength. But the purpose is defense. We have no other aim.

In common with others of the free world, the United States does not rely on military strength alone to win the peace. Our primary reliance is a unity among us forged of common adherence to moral principles. This reliance binds together in fellowship all those who believe in the spiritual nature of man, as the Child of God.

Moreover, our country assuredly claims no monopoly on wisdom. We are willing—nay, anxious—to discuss with friends and with any others all possible paths to peace. We will use every means, from the normal diplomatic exchange to the forum of the United Nations, to further this search. We welcome ideas, expressions of honest difference, new proposals and new interpretations of old ones, anything and everything honestly

<sup>1</sup>For text, see p. 745.

offered for the advancement of man's oldest aspiration.

There are no insoluble problems. Differences can be resolved; tensions can be relieved. The free world, I deeply believe, holds firmly to this faith, striving earnestly toward what is just and equitable.

My friends, allow me to interpolate here, merely an expression of my own personal faith. I call upon all of those who are in responsible position, either in civil government or in the military world.

In the dark days of 1940 and 1941 and 1942, there seemed no place from which to start to conquer the enemy that bade fair to enslave us all. Already he had put most of Europe under his heel. When I stop to think of the bewilderment of our people, the fears of our people in those days, and then how in a few short years we were coming home to celebrate that great victory that we thought could at last mark the end of all wars, we see how fast human affairs, human outlooks can change, from one of despondency, almost of despair, in many quarters, to one of exultation.

Now today, as we fail to understand the intransigence that we feel marks others, as we try to color every proposal we make with what we believe to be reason, understanding—even sympathy, as we are nonplussed as to why these offers are never taken up, let us never despair that faith will win through.

The world that God has given us is, of course, material in its values, intellectual and spiritual. We have got to hand on to those who come after us this balance—this balance of values, and particularly the certainty that they can enjoy the same kind of opportunity in this spiritual, intellectual, and material world that we, who will then be their ancestors, enjoyed before them.

That, it seems to me, is the real problem that Canada and the United States today have to meet. And it is the one reason I get such a thrill every time I come to this country, because here I sense in the very atmosphere your determination to work in that direction, not acknowledging defeat, certain that we can win because there are values that man treasures above all things else in the world that are now at stake.

The free world believes that practical problems can be solved practically; that they should be solved by orderly procedure, step by step, so that the foundation for peace, which we are building in concert with other nations, will be solid and unshakable. I deem it a high privilege to salute, through this their Parliament, the Canadian people for the strength they have added to this faith—and for the contribution they are making toward its realization.

Beyond the shadow of the atomic cloud, the horizon is bright with promise. No shadow can halt our advance together. For we, Canada and the United States, shall use carefully and wisely the God-given graces of faith and reason as we

march together toward it—toward the horizon of a world where each man, each family, each nation, lives at peace in a climate of freedom.

#### TEXT OF JOINT COMMUNIQUE

During the course of President Eisenhower's state visit to Canada, the Prime Minister of Canada and members of the Canadian Cabinet had an opportunity of having informal discussions with him on matters of mutual interest to the United States and Canada. The President and the Prime Minister last reviewed some of these questions when the Prime Minister visited Washington last May.<sup>2</sup>

2. Views were exchanged on recent developments in the world situation and on measures which might bring about a relaxation of current international tensions. It was agreed that all efforts for peace and improved world conditions being made by the United Nations or elsewhere should be supported and the necessity of maintaining the strength, unity, and determination of the free world to resist aggression was fully recognized.

3. The President and the Prime Minister agreed on the importance to the free world of healthy national economies and of the expansion of world trade on a multilateral basis. Satisfaction was expressed at the recent establishment of a joint United States-Canadian Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs. The importance of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project was emphasized, and there was full agreement on the urgency of initiating the first phase—construction of the Power Project in accordance with arrangements which already have been made between the two governments.

4. In discussing the means of strengthening the security of the free world, the importance of collective arrangements under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was emphasized, including the special responsibility of the United States and Canada for building up the defenses of this continent. There was complete agreement on the vital importance of effective methods for joint defense, especially in the light of evidence of increasing technical capability of direct attack on both countries by weapons of great destructive power. Cooperation on joint defense matters had its origin in the Ogdensburg Agreement of 1940 which established the Permanent Joint Board on Defense. In 1947 the two countries issued a joint statement which set forth the principles and methods by which cooperation would be continued and strengthened. The full respect of each country for the sovereignty of the other is inherent in these

<sup>2</sup> For text of the communique issued on that occasion, see BULLETIN of May 25, 1953, p. 752.

principles. These principles are equally valid today when Canada and the United States, recognizing that the defense of North America must be considered as a whole, are undertaking further efforts for their joint security. The arrangements for collaboration which have proved satisfactory over the years provide a firm basis on which to carry forward the close relationship between Canada and the United States in matters of common defense.

## JOINT BOARD OF ENGINEERS ESTABLISHED FOR ST. LAWRENCE RIVER PROJECT

### White House Announcement of November 12

White House press release dated November 12

The White House announced today that the Governments of the United States of America and of Canada have concluded an agreement for the establishment of the St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers.

The purpose of this four-man Board is to review, co-ordinate, and approve the plans and specifications of the power works and the construction program in the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River. The Board is to assure itself that the construction of the Power Project is in accordance with the approval given by both Governments and the International Joint Commission.<sup>3</sup>

The Agreement, which is now in force, is contained in an Exchange of Notes signed at Washington today by the Secretary of State and by the Canadian Ambassador, A. D. P. Heeney.

On November 4, 1953, an Executive Order was issued establishing the United States Section of the St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers.<sup>4</sup> The Secretary of the Army and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission were designated as the United States members.

### Texts of Notes

#### Ambassador Heeney to Secretary Dulles

No. 820

WASHINGTON, D. C.  
November 12, 1953.

SIR, I have the honour to refer to the Order of Approval issued by the International Joint Commission on October 29, 1952, under authority of the Boundary Waters Treaty of January 11, 1909, in the matter of the applications of the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America for an Order of Approval for the construction of certain works for the development of power in the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River.

The Government of Canada has designated the Hydro-

<sup>3</sup> For text of the Commission's Order of Approval, see *ibid.*, Dec. 29, 1952, p. 1019.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, Nov. 23, 1953, p. 724.

November 30, 1953

Electric Power Commission of Ontario as the entity to construct, maintain and operate the proposed works in Canada and I have been informed that the Government of the United States, consistent with the action of the Federal Power Commission in licensing the Power Authority of the State of New York, has declared that authority to be the designee of the Government of the United States of America for the construction of the works referred to in the Order of Approval of the International Joint Commission of October 29, 1952. It would, therefore, be agreeable to the Canadian Government if the St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers, proposed in the applications of both Governments to the International Joint Commission and approved in that Commission's Order, were now established so that the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario and the Power Authority of the State of New York may submit their plans and programmes of construction to the Board for its approval.

The Canadian Government suggests that the Board consist of four members, two to be designated by and to act on behalf of the Government of Canada and two to be designated by and to act on behalf of the Government of the United States of America, and that the Board should perform the duties specified in clause (g) of the Order of Approval, including the approval of the plans and specifications of the works and the programmes of construction thereof, submitted for approval of the respective Governments as required by the Order of Approval, and assurance that the construction of the works is in accordance with such approval.

Reports shall be made by the Joint Board of Engineers to the respective governments to keep them currently informed of the progress of the construction of the works.

If the Government of the United States is agreeable to the foregoing proposals, I suggest that this note and your reply should constitute an agreement between our two governments establishing the St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers.

Accept [etc.].

#### Secretary Dulles to Ambassador Heeney

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to your note No. 820 of November 12, 1953, in which you made proposals for the establishment of the St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers.

I have the honor to inform you that the Government of the United States concurs in these proposals and agrees that your note and the present reply shall constitute an agreement between our two Governments establishing the St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers, as proposed in the applications of each Government, dated June 30, 1952, to the International Joint Commission and approved in that Commission's Order of October 29, 1953.

Accept [etc.].

## ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

### White House Announcement of November 12

White House press release dated November 12

The President today announced that the Governments of the United States and Canada have concluded an agreement establishing a joint United States-Canadian Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs. The agreement was effected by an exchange of notes between the Canadian Ambassador in Washington and the United States Secretary of State today. The Canadian members of the Committee will consist of the Secretary of



State for External Affairs and the Ministers of Finance, Trade and Commerce, Agriculture or Fisheries. The United States members will be the Secretaries of State, and Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce.

The suggestion that a joint committee of this type might be established was originally made during the visit of the Prime Minister to Washington last May. Both Governments have recognized that the free world is vitally interested in promoting a healthy flow of international trade. The activities of the Joint Committee will constitute one aspect of the efforts of both countries in promoting satisfactory trade relations on a multi-lateral basis throughout the free world.

The Joint Committee, which will meet at least once a year alternately in Washington and Ottawa, will consider broad questions affecting the harmonious economic relations of the two countries. After receiving reports of the Joint Committee's work each Government will have an opportunity to consider measures to improve economic relations and to encourage the flow of trade.

This announcement is being released simultaneously in Ottawa by the Department of External Affairs.

#### Texts of Notes

##### *Ambassador Heeney to Secretary Dulles*

No. 821

WASHINGTON, D. C.  
November 12, 1953.

SIR, I have the honour to refer to recent conversations between representatives of our two Governments concerning the establishment of a joint economic committee. These discussions revealed a desire on the part of both Governments to make arrangements for periodic consultation between their respective Cabinet members having major responsibility for economic policy.

I have the honour to propose, therefore, that our two Governments agree:

(a) That there shall be established a Joint United States-Canadian Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs to consist,

for CANADA, of the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Ministers of Finance, Trade and Commerce, and either the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Fisheries, as appropriate, and, for the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, of the Secretaries of State, the Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce,

together with such other officials of Cabinet rank as either Government may designate from time to time, as the need arises;

(b) That the Committee's functions shall be:

- (1) To consider matters affecting the harmonious economic relations between the two countries;
- (2) In particular, to exchange information and views on matters which might adversely affect the high level of mutually profitable trade which has been built up;
- (3) To report to the respective Governments on such discussions in order that consideration may be given to measures deemed appropriate and necessary to improve economic relations and to encourage the flow of trade;

(c) That the Committee shall meet once a year or more often, as may be considered necessary by the two Governments;

(d) That the Committee shall meet alternately in Washington and Ottawa, the Chairman to be a Canadian member when the meetings are held in Canada, and a United States member when meetings are held in the United States.

If the Government of the United States is agreeable to the foregoing proposals, I suggest that the present Note and your reply to that effect should constitute an agreement between our two Governments which shall take effect this day and shall remain in force until such time as either Government shall have given notice in writing of its desire to terminate the agreement.

Accept [etc.]

##### *Secretary Dulles to Ambassador Heeney*

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to your Note No. 821 of November 12, 1953, in which you made proposals for the establishment of a Joint United States-Canadian Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs.

I have the honor to inform you that the Government of the United States concurs in these proposals and agrees that your note and the present reply should constitute an agreement between our two Governments which shall take effect this day and which shall remain in force until such time as either Government shall have given notice in writing of its desire to terminate the agreement.

Accept [etc.].

#### Three Power Conference Scheduled

White House press release dated November 10

It has been decided to hold the Three Power Conference at Bermuda which was planned for the beginning of July but had to be put off.<sup>1</sup> President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles will represent the United States; M. Laniel, President of the Council of Ministers, and M. Bidault, Foreign Minister, will represent France; and Sir Winston Churchill and Mr. Eden, Foreign Minister, will represent Britain. It is hoped to meet from December 4 to December 8, and various matters of common concern to the Three Powers will be discussed.

#### Letter of Credence

##### *Afghanistan*

The newly appointed Ambassador of Afghanistan, Mohammad Kabir Ludin, presented his credentials to the President on November 19. For the text of the Ambassador's remarks and the text of the President's reply, see Department of State press release 630 of November 19.

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of June 1, 1953, p. 778.



## The Moral Initiative

*Address by the Secretary<sup>1</sup>*

I greatly appreciate your cordial invitation which has brought me here. At first, acceptance seemed impractical, for I myself had joined in an invitation to Mr. Molotov to meet in Switzerland this week to discuss the problem of Germany. However the Soviets last week rejected our invitation without benefit of courtesy. That is to be regretted. But at least it made me free to join you here, as I gladly did when your invitation was renewed. I might add that our invitation to Mr. Molotov also remains open.

I know that you did not invite me because you always agree with me. But the fact that you do not makes your invitation the more significant.

It is significant of tolerance and it is significant of nonpartisanship in relation to foreign policy. These are two precious assets to be preserved. They are not preserved by mere lip service, but only by actual practice. I am grateful to you for practicing on me.

The broad lines of United States foreign policy were set for us, long ago, by our founders. The opening paragraph of the *Federalist Papers* says that it seems to have been reserved to the American people, by their conduct and example, to show the possibilities of a free society. This opportunity was looked upon as one to use not merely for ourselves but for the benefit of all mankind.

As our people have had that spirit and put it to work, we have gained the satisfaction which comes from creative effort, and we have had an environment of goodwill which has contributed mightily to our security.

The challenge which today stems from Soviet Russia is uniquely formidable. But it is, in modern garb, similar to what our nation faced during its early years. Then Czar Alexander was the world's most powerful ruler, and he and his allied despots of Europe extended their power throughout much of the world—in Europe, Asia, South America, and North America. Along our West

Coast the Russians both held Alaska and infiltrated south as far as the San Francisco area. It was this menace, primarily as it stemmed from Russia, which led to the pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine.

That doctrine prevailed. But that was not merely because the words were bold. It was in large part because we showed, in actual works, the superiority of freedom over despotism. Under our free political institutions men were producing fruits so good that others, everywhere, wanted like opportunities for themselves. Despotism fell into a disrepute that was born out of contrast with freedom. Gradually despotism receded; and Russian power withdrew to where it belongs, that is, Russia.

Today, when despotism is again threatening throughout the world, we need to draw on our earlier experience.

The great weakness of despotism has been, is, and always will be, its disregard of the rights of man. Despotism can always be routed if free men exploit that weakness. If our example can illumine again the great advantages of a free society, then Soviet communism will lose its deceptive appeal. Furthermore, it will lose its grip upon the enslaved whom it now holds. The tide of despotism will recede during the second half of this century as it receded during the first half of the preceding century.

You will see that I agree with your President Walter Reuther when he said: "The quest for liberty constitutes the eventual victorious challenge to the totalitarian system."

This quest for liberty must be simultaneously pursued on three fronts—the home front, the free-world front, and the captive-world front.

### The Home Front

I shall not attempt to analyze our homefront problems except to emphasize their intimate relation to foreign policy. This administration knows full well that it is not possible to formulate and execute a clear, positive, and effective foreign

<sup>1</sup> Made before the Congress of Industrial Organizations at Cleveland, Ohio, on Nov. 18 (press release 624 dated Nov. 17).

policy except against a background of American well-being and opportunity. That, as I said, was the creed of the founders. It is our creed today.

This nation now has a great military establishment. We need that to deter open aggression against ourselves and others who depend on us as we depend on them. But military accomplishments alone are not a sufficient basis for foreign policy. They provide no great contrast with the despots. They too can build great military establishments, and they do. It is up to us to produce also accomplishments in welfare and justice that the despots cannot match.

Fortunately, our own nation's fabulous productive power does make it possible for us to be militarily strong while also raising living standards. But even we have a problem of balance. And we must not assume that each of our allies can match our formula in this respect.

That problem needs to be studied in relation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It was originally dedicated to a larger military program than some of the members could live with. NATO must find a sound scale of military exertion.

That is a matter to which this administration is giving close attention. It was considered at the NATO Council meeting last April, and no doubt it will actively engage the Council's attention at next month's meeting in Paris.

Military establishments and political alliances alone will not buy peace, security, and happiness. We must find the way to do also what despotism can never do. That means we must recognize the equal dignity of all men and find a way to provide opportunity that extends from the most fortunate to the least fortunate among us.

Specifically and concretely, this administration is committed to the development of policies that will bring the greatest good to the greatest number. There must be lifted from the minds of all our people the fears of disaster, poverty, and old age. Our entire economy must be such as to develop a system of prosperous industry and agriculture and service. Above all, it must help to insure an equitable distribution of the resulting products.

During the period of the industrial revolution, political liberty won fame by its mechanical feats, which multiplied many times the productivity of labor. Today the task is not only to attain increasing productivity, but also to insure that the resultant products are distributed in ways which reflect those moral and spiritual concepts which self-seeking despots always ignore. Our 160 million people should always constitute, by every honorable test, the finest advertisement for freedom.

Your organization has helped to insure that America stands for that kind of freedom by using your power with moderation, wisdom, and effectiveness. By continuing in that way, you will help

to make it possible to have a foreign policy which will meet the high standard of American tradition.

### The Free World Front

On the free-world front the colonial and dependent areas are the field of most dramatic contest. Here the policies of the West and those of Soviet imperialism come into headlong collision.

The Western Powers practiced colonialism, particularly during the 19th century. But it was inevitable that their colonialism would be transitory and self-liquidating, because Western civilization was based on belief in the spiritual nature of man. Western ascendancy was no mere exhibition of brute force. The West had something to offer that others wanted. That was not shackles, but the moral and economic keys to freedom. For example, missionaries and merchants went everywhere, deterred by no martyrdom and no hardship.

The missionaries brought a concept of the spiritual nature of man that was fresh to much of the world, although it had long ago had its beginning in Judea, where East and West met. It was the same concept that had been politically translated into the Magna Carta, the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, and our own Declaration of Independence. Each of these historic pronouncements had universal import and led logically to the pledge by the United Nations Charter to develop self-government and free political institutions among all non-self-governing peoples.

Human liberty requires an economic, as well as a political, foundation. These, too, the West supplied as economic pioneers gave worldwide currency to the products of Western inventiveness. They developed forgotten and hidden natural resources throughout the world. They built railroads and ports and works of irrigation. They taught the techniques of their own productivity. These political and economic tasks must be pursued.

We cannot, however, ignore the hazards created by international communism, which plots to pervert nationalism to its own imperialistic ends.

The Soviet leaders, in mapping their strategy for world conquest, hit on nationalism as a device for absorbing the colonial peoples. Stalin, in his classic lecture on the Foundations of Leninism, says that "The road to victory of the revolution in the West lies through the revolutionary alliance with the liberation movement of the colonies and dependent countries."

There is then outlined a two-phased, and two-faced, program. In the first phase the Communist agitators are to whip up the nationalistic aspirations of the people, so that they will rebel violently against the existing order. Then, before newly won independence can become consolidated and vigorous in its own right, Communists

will take over the new government and use this power to "amalgamate" the peoples into the Soviet orbit.

That plot is in active operation. Throughout the newly liberated areas and those which seek liberty, Communists operate, usually disguised as local patriots.

Your CIO knows from its own experience how insidious Communist infiltration can be. You have fought it and helped others fight it, at home and abroad. Out of your honorable effort you must have come to realize that this is no time to fragmentize the free world into a multiplicity of weak and unrelated political units. Those who would be free must accept a large measure of interdependence to protect their freedom.

George Washington, in transmitting the proposed Constitution of the United States, said that it would be—

obviously impractical to secure all rights of independent sovereignty to each [state] and yet provide for the interests and safety of all. Individuals entering into society must give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest.

It is useful for the members of our free-world society to heed George Washington's advice.

There are some who, having just gained political independence, already stand close to losing it in the way the Communists planned. Some non-self-governing peoples, if they won today what the extremists demand, would find that they had fallen into the Communist trap. This is a time when the development of genuine independence is a task of infinite difficulty and delicacy. Zeal needs to be balanced by patience.

Fortunately, despite the obstacles that communism has created, orderly evolution goes on. Let me give three illustrations.

In Indochina the French made a July 3, 1953, Declaration of Independence for the Associated States of Cambodia, Laos, and Viet-Nam. Today these States and the French are taking practical steps to make that independence a reality. The United States rejoices at this development. At the same time we have pointed out to the leaders of the Associated States that they could scarcely hope to preserve their independence in isolation. Economically, politically, militarily, they would, at first, be weak and dangerously exposed. The French Union, like the British Commonwealth, could be a framework within which independence and interdependence can find voluntary expression.

In the Sudan, the United Kingdom and Egypt this year freely gave up their joint rule so as to provide for the self-determination of the people. The Sudanese are this month holding their first election. They are organizing a legislature which will take over many of the duties which the British Governor General had previously carried out. This legislature will rule the country for a period of 3 years. Then a constituent assembly will be

elected to determine the future status of the Sudan.

In the Philippines the Communist inspired Huks have been seeking to destroy civic order. Then, last week, came general elections, under conditions of severe strain. Many feared that the Philippine people and their leaders would not be sufficiently vigilant and dedicated to preserve their freedom. The result is a thrilling demonstration of the capacity of the Philippine nation for self-government. There was an orderly change of power which reflects credit upon all concerned. The political independence consummated in 1946, after 50 years of preparation, stood solid against all internal threats.

Externally there is interdependence expressed by the Mutual Defense Pact, which I was privileged to sign for the United States in 1951.

Perhaps some of you feel that your government is not pushing political liberty as strongly as it should. I can say to you three things:

First, we are pushing for self-government more than appears on the surface.

Secondly, where we exercise restraint it is because of a reasoned conviction that precipitate action would in fact not produce independence but only transition to a captivity far worse than present dependence.

Thirdly, we are alert to the possibility that the Communist threat might grow into an excuse for delay, when it is not an honest reason for delay.

There are good and sufficient reasons why the United States desires, in the United Nations and elsewhere, to show unity with its Western allies. But we have not forgotten that we were the first colony to win independence. And we have not given a blank check to any colonial power.

There is no slightest wavering in our conviction that the orderly transition from colonial to self-governing status should be carried resolutely to a completion.

### The Captive World Front

The third front is the captive world front. During the last 10 years 600 million people peacefully won political independence from the West. But, during the same period, a comparable number were impressed into Communist servitude. They too deserve our thoughts.

Most of the captive people are essentially religious and patriotic folk. Very few of them are international Communists. Even in Soviet Russia itself the Communist Party membership is only about 3 percent of the population. The balance, except for a favored few, are the most exploited people in the world today. You, and your fellow workers in the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, know the situation thoroughly.

These newly enslaved nations are being made to serve the ambitions of a small materialistic group



which fanatically believes that peace and prosperity require a world of conformity. In that world there are to be no distinctive characteristics of nation, creed, and individuality; there all men, like domesticated animals, are to perform slavishly the acts prescribed by a few rulers who exercise the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Such a system, unless it changes, is doomed ultimately to collapse. The time of collapse depends largely on whether we produce the richer fruits of freedom; whether that is known behind the Iron Curtain; and whether these captive peoples also know that they are not forgotten, that we are not reconciled to their fate, and, above all, that we are not prepared to seek safety for ourselves by a bargain with their masters which will confirm their captivity.

It is not necessary, nor is it desirable, that we should try to foment violent revolution. That would mean only the exposure and massacre of those who most cherish freedom. Nonviolent methods can be more efficacious.

All rulers, however absolute, depend on the productivity of the ruled. You cannot dig coal with bayonets.

Already the Soviet rulers are gravely preoccupied with the mood of the captive workers. The events of last June, in Eastern Germany and East Berlin, showed that the workers were being exploited to the breaking point.

The fact that the Soviet rulers now refuse to meet to discuss European problems is not a sign of strength, but of fear. They dare not admit of a prospect of greater liberty anywhere behind the Iron Curtain, lest restiveness increase everywhere behind that curtain. So, they slammed the door on a European conference, and started diversionary talk about our being buddies with aggressor China.

The Soviet rulers have retreated into a diplomatic defensive. The free world now has the diplomatic and moral initiative.

We shall, I hope, sustain that initiative by being ready to talk about any concrete point of difference—whether it be in Europe or in Asia, or whether it be in relation to armaments. Persistence and strength won us an honorable end to the fighting in Korea. We must never grow weary or become discouraged in the quest for other honorable settlements of concrete issues.

But some cautions should be observed. Our zeal for conference should never lead us to confer where the only probable result would be an apparent moral approval of the Kremlin's rule over the peoples of 15 once independent nations.

Also, we should never, as the price for admission to a conference, abandon basic positions and programs in Asia or Europe.

Let us always remember what President Eisenhower has so often emphasized, that what counts the most are deeds, not words.

The free peoples can promote their own security by deeds which confront the Soviet world with living examples of how a free society works creatively to advance human welfare. That is one reason why this administration attaches such high importance to the growing political, economic, and military unity of Western Europe. The now operating Coal and Steel Community and the prospective European Defense and Political Communities are not merely defensive measures. They are the most valid and effective exhibits of freedom in action. That is bound to be contagious.

In the Pacific area, there are similar opportunities to set examples—in Indochina, Formosa, Japan, and Korea. If India and Pakistan develop economic well-being under their free societies, that will do more than armies to dislodge communism in China.

In all these matters the United States has a great responsibility. We are fortunately located because both to the East and West there are brave and free people between us and the Soviet-dominated world. But it cannot be assumed that that will always be the case. That depends largely on what we do.

Freedom never thrives in a conservatory. Freedom becomes a satisfying and contagious thing only as it is put to ennobling use. Your Government is acting in that faith. At all the critical points, we seek, with other friendly nations, to put freedom into action.

We know that we shall not have an unbroken series of successes. Sometimes the obstacles are greater than foreseen. Sometimes known obstacles make success far from certain. Such possibilities should not stop us from striving, for nothing makes policy more cowardly and more feeble than the premise that no setbacks can be risked.

This is the spirit that today animates the administration's foreign policy. To carry on we need public support. We do not ask for uncritical support. But we do ask for support which is understanding and which does not demand a perfection which is humanly unattainable.

Also, we need concurrent action by private peoples and organizations. A society is not truly free if everything is left to government. Responsibility must be shared by nongovernmental persons.

I believe that the American people are aware of their responsibilities and want to discharge them. They do not want to live cheaply or meanly, or for themselves alone. I know that that is the viewpoint of your CIO. We sometimes differ, but I feel that we share the same basic viewpoint in relation to world affairs. I ask that you steadily assert that viewpoint; both upon those of us who act officially in Washington, and also upon the American people. For their word is the last word.



## Invitation to Four-Power Meeting Left Open

*Following is the text of an exchange of notes between the U.S. and Soviet Governments regarding the invitation extended to the U.S.S.R. to participate in a four-power meeting to consider questions relating to Germany and Austria. The U.S. note was delivered to the Soviet Foreign Ministry on November 16 by Elim O'Shaughnessy, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim at Moscow. Similar notes were delivered to the Foreign Ministry on the same day on behalf of the British and French Governments.*

### U.S. NOTE OF NOVEMBER 16

Press release 618 dated November 16

In close consultation with the Governments of France and the United Kingdom, the United States Government has carefully studied the Soviet Government's note of November 3 in reply to the note of October 18<sup>1</sup> in which the U.S. Government proposed that the four Ministers of Foreign Affairs should meet at Lugano on November 9. The Government of the German Federal Republic and the German authorities in Berlin have also been consulted.

The U.S. Government notes with regret that the Soviet Government has for the third time within the past four months ignored its invitation to discuss the most urgent international problems. The U.S. Government is still of the opinion that the best way of reducing international tension is to persevere in constructive efforts for the progressive solution of outstanding problems, starting with those which most urgently require an early settlement. With this in mind, the United States Government proposed a meeting of the four Foreign Ministers in order to reach agreement on Germany, especially on its reunification in freedom, and on the Austrian State Treaty. In the same spirit, it is continuing its efforts to enable the political conference on Korea to take place.

To judge from its note of November 3, the Soviet Government contemplates a meeting of the Foreign Ministers, "with the participation of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese Peoples Republic," of such a different character that it would not only become involved in futile and endless debate, but would also prevent all progress in the settlement of questions which are both urgent and concrete.

The United States Government laid down no conditions in its invitation and made every possible effort to take into account the views of the Soviet Government. But the latter has made a

meeting of the Foreign Ministers conditional upon the acceptance of a number of demands. Some of these have no relation to Europe, but must in the Soviet view be met before even the study of European problems could be initiated. Others would entail the abandonment by the U.S., U.K. and France of all their plans to safeguard their own security. A defenseless Western Europe appears to be the price demanded by the Soviet Government for participation in a conference. The Soviet Government must be well aware that such demands are totally unacceptable.

The United States Government can only conclude from the latest Soviet note that the Soviet Government does not wish at the present time to enter into any negotiations which might have positive results. The U.S. Government nevertheless remains determined to seek by all appropriate means agreement on the most urgent question the solution of which is essential to the lessening of international tension. Therefore it leaves open the invitation addressed to the Soviet Government on October 18. The U.S. Government is convinced that negotiations on these vital problems would open the way to broader agreement and would thus improve the chances of re-establishing real peace in the world.

### SOVIET NOTE OF NOVEMBER 3

[Unofficial translation]

The Soviet Government acknowledges the receipt of the note of the Government of the United States of America of October 18, which is in answer to the note of the Soviet Government of September 28.<sup>2</sup>

In its note of October 18, just as in its former note of September 2,<sup>3</sup> the Government of the United States of America avoids the principal questions posed by the Government of the Soviet Union whose examination has the aim of contributing to the settlement of unresolved international problems and of strengthening the peace. Meanwhile, the necessity for such a settlement has become still more pressing.

It is also impossible to ignore the fact that the latest note of the Government of the United States of America is once again the result of separate collusion of the Three Powers, i. e., the United States of America, England, and France. Accordingly, the new meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Three Powers at London, like the preceding meeting at Washington, in no way facilitates the task of a settlement of unresolved international problems. On the contrary, such meetings cannot but limit initiative and the possibilities of attainment of an agreement between the interested powers, a fact which naturally is contrary to the interests of international cooperation.

In its note of September 28, the Soviet Government drew the attention of the Government of the United States of America, as well as the Governments of Great Britain and France, to the necessity of an examination of measures for lessening tension in international relations by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the United States of America, England, France, the Chinese People's Republic, and the Soviet Union. In this regard the Soviet Government has been guided by the fact that the Governments

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Oct. 26, 1953, p. 547.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 548.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Sept. 14, 1953, p. 351.

of the indicated powers are also expressing a desire to reach such an understanding as would lead even in the near future to a lessening of international tension, and this, in its turn, would make possible the attainment of positive results in the settlement of urgent international problems. In advancing this proposal, the Soviet Government proceeded from the fact that favorable conditions have been created for this at the present time, especially in connection with the conclusion of an armistice in Korea.

It is well known what a favorable effect the statement of the Government of the Chinese People's Republic had on the achievement of an armistice in Korea. This Government, together with the Government of the Korean Popular Democratic Republic, took the initiative which led to the agreement on termination of bloodshed in Korea. It would be completely natural to expect further steps toward the easing of international tension from both interested parties. A refusal to consider the question of easing tension in international relations could not be considered other than as an unwillingness to contribute to the settlement of unresolved questions, and thereby to contribute to the strengthening of peace and international security.

One of the chief elements bearing witness to the great tension in international relations is the fact that, during the course of recent years, the armaments race is increasing ever further, including atomic and hydrogen weapons; military groupings of some states against other states are being formed; a network of military bases established by certain states on the territories of other states is growing rapidly; and so forth. If the Government of the United States, like the Government of the U.S.S.R., recognizes that such a situation increases the threat of a new world war and that an examination of the above-mentioned most important international questions must not be postponed for an indefinite period, then in that case objections to undertaking an examination of the question of measures for the lessening of international tension without further delay should disappear. In contrary case, it would be impossible to assure appropriate conditions for the resolution of urgent international problems, to the settlement of which the Government of the United States of America also attaches great importance.

In its note of October 18, the Government of the United States of America refers to the fact that several questions raised in the Soviet Government's note of September 28, including the disarmament question, are already being considered or will be considered by the General Assembly of the United Nations. However, it is impossible to acknowledge this reference as in any degree well founded. In the United Nations, several important questions related to the maintenance of international peace have been considered from the very beginning of the organization. This refers especially to such questions as the limitation and regulation of armaments, the prohibition of atomic and other types of weapons of mass destruction, the impermissibility of the establishment of military bases on foreign territory, the impermissibility of propaganda aimed at the preparation of a new world war. However, as is well known, the solution to these important questions in the United Nations has encountered serious difficulties. As a result, the armaments race being carried on by certain countries not only is not decreasing, but is continuing in still greater measure, in connection with which the tax burden which broad sections of the population of these countries bears on its shoulders is increasing without interruption, and weapons of mass destruction are becoming ever more destructive and dangerous, especially with the appearance of the hydrogen bomb. Full settlement of the Korean question has great significance for the easing of tension in international relations. At the present time this requires that the question of national unification and the establishment of a stable peace in Korea be settled on the basis of the armistice reached. The convocation of a political conference on Korea should answer these ends.

The Soviet Government has already noted in its note of September 28 that the convocation of this conference is facing serious difficulties in connection with the examination of the question of conferences. There still exists a clear undervaluation of the significance of the agreed actions on this question with such directly interested states as the Chinese People's Republic and the Korean Popular Democratic Republic. As should be completely obvious, the success of the Korean political conference depends to a great extent on the coordination of the actions of the most interested parties and on the participation in this conference of other neutral states which contributed to the attainment of the armistice in Korea and which can offer substantial help in the settlement of the whole Korean question. In accordance with existing understanding, there is already taking place a meeting between the parties at Panmunjom, called for the examination of unsettled questions connected with the preparations for the Korean political conference. If the Government of the United States of America and the governments of certain other countries bearing responsibility for the difficulties which have arisen in the settlement of the Korean question, in particular for the difficulties connected with a decision of the question, are really striving for the success of this conference, then they cannot fail to take into account the above-mentioned legitimate demands of the Korean-Chinese side which, as has been shown by the consideration of the question of the conference composition at the Seventh Session of the U.N. General Assembly, are shared by the majority of the states in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

The easing of tension in international relations also depends to a great extent on the settlement of the question of mutual relations with the Chinese People's Republic, the re-establishment of China's legitimate rights in the United Nations, and its participation in the decision of the fundamental questions relating to the maintenance of peace and security of peoples. To ignore the necessity of an urgent decision on questions relating to the re-establishment of national rights of the Chinese People's Republic and to delay the implementation of China's participation with full rights in the settlement of urgent international problems is to contribute to the further maintenance of international tension. It is impossible to limit the matter to the participation of the Chinese People's Republic in the Korean conference, inasmuch as the positive results of this conference are also in no small measure connected with the recognition of the rights and legitimate interests of the Chinese people in the settlement of other important international problems. It is also necessary to recognize as impermissible a situation whereby in recent years there have taken place a number of acts of aggression in relation to the Chinese People's Republic provoked by certain powers.

From all this it follows that for the regulation of urgent international problems having great significance for the lessening of international tension, to say nothing about the special problems relating to the situation in South East Asia and the Pacific Ocean, it is urgently necessary to call a conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Five Powers: United States, England, France, the Chinese People's Republic, and the Soviet Union.

In reply to the Soviet Government's proposal concerning the calling of a conference composed of the Foreign Ministers of the Five Powers to examine means to lessen tension in international relations the U.S. Government expressed its readiness to consider the causes of such tension with a view to eliminating them. At the same time, however, the U.S. Government stated that it "wishes to do so under conditions which offer reasonable prospects for positive results and assure that the views of the directly interested governments are properly represented."

Thus, stating its readiness to examine the causes of present international tension in order to eliminate them, the U.S. Government there and then refuses to call a conference of the five powers at the present time. This is evident from the fact that it advances various preconditions directed toward a postponement of the calling of the

above-mentioned conference for an indefinite period. If the U.S. Government in the future continues to insist on these preconditions, it will be evidence that it does not in fact desire an easing of international tension and a corresponding settlement of unresolved international problems.

In refusing a convocation of a five-power conference the U.S. Government points out that it has agreed to a convocation of the Korean political conference where all these powers might be represented. However, that this statement of the U.S. Government is without foundation, if only for the fact that the position it has taken in rejecting the participation of neutral countries in the Korean conference, makes the participation of the U.S.S.R. in this conference impossible. One must not forget that it is impossible at the Korean conference to consider the general question of lessening of international tension, urgent consideration of which can not be denied at the present time.

In its note of September 28 the Soviet Government drew attention to the fact that recent political developments in West Germany have increased alarm in the peace-loving countries of Europe. Ruling circles in Western Germany openly set as their goal the accelerated implementation of a plan for remilitarization. Measures for the creation of a regular army, air force, and navy are being carried out. Hundreds of industrial enterprises are being converted to serve military needs. West German monopolists who in their time inspired Hitlerite aggression are engaged in the re-establishment of war industry. Those generals who created the Hitlerite army and carried out Hitler's military plans are again assuming leadership over the creation of armed forces in West Germany. The present Bonn Government which expresses the aspirations of aggressive circles of West German monopolists and Hitlerite military leadership already feels no necessity to hide its aggressive aims in regard to its neighboring states. Ruling circles in West Germany openly advertise their revanchist plans, a fact which creates an increasing threat to European security. West German revanchists, who have raised their heads recently, are trying to secure the support of aggressive circles in other states.

In this situation one cannot fail to see the danger in the endeavors of the ruling circles in West Germany to hasten in every way the ratification and entry into force of both the Paris and Bonn agreements, with which are bound up their calculations for the acceleration of the remilitarization of West Germany and for the realization of their revanchist plans in Europe. In these circumstances one should recognize as particularly impermissible those attempts at crude pressure which have recently been undertaken in relation, for example, to France, to overcome public resistance to the Bonn and Paris agreements.

Inasmuch as the Paris agreement concerning the so-called European army, including West German armed forces, means creating a regular army in West Germany, West German revanchists stop at nothing to achieve this agreement's entry into force. In addition West German revanchist circles are exerting continuous pressure to hasten the entry into force of the Bonn agreement also. They intend to utilize this agreement as well, which leaves West Germany for decades in the position of an occupied country, in order subsequently to free their hands, having joined the North Atlantic military group of powers and having secured the support of the most aggressive forces of this group.

Entry into force of the Paris and Bonn agreements would mean that the remilitarization of West Germany will get full under way. And then, as is witnessed by the grievous experience of the peoples of Europe, West German revanchists will cease paying any attention to many paragraphs of these agreements. Then they will do everything possible to involve the parties to these agreements in adventures, which will facilitate their starting a war for the accomplishment of their criminal revanchist aims.

The peace-loving peoples of Europe, and above all West Germany's neighbors, cannot fail to take this into account. The lessons of history are well known to all

whereby neighboring countries, which German militarists never hesitated to dig up pretexts for attacking, became the first victims of aggressive German militarism.

In connection with this it is understandable that the U.S. Government's note of October 18 touches on so serious a question as that of European security, to which the Soviet Government has always attached greatest significance. One cannot but admit that only such a solution of the German problem as will guarantee the restoration of the national unity of Germany as a democratic and peace-loving state and also guarantee the interests of the security of all other European states will accord with the interests of the peace-loving peoples of Europe as well as the interests of the German people itself. This means that the formation of a special military group of European states directed against some states of Europe, such as creation of the so-called European army now being undertaken, has nothing in common with real European security.

One should not forget that there exist the Franco-Soviet treaty of 1944 and also the Anglo-Soviet treaty of 1942 according to which the U.S.S.R. and France as well as the U.S.S.R. and England assumed obligations to undertake joint measures against possible new aggression on the part of German militarism which in addition is in accord with the aims of insuring the security of all European states. To forget these important obligations would not be in the interests of France and England. As regards the Soviet Union for its part now as previously, it is fully ready not only not to weaken these obligations but also to take into account existing new possibilities for insuring security in Europe.

However, the position of the U.S. Government regarding the German problem expressed in the referenced note as well as in its previous notes does not at all accord with the interests of insuring European security, since they ignore not only the above-mentioned obligations but also the provisions of the Potsdam conference of 1945 according to which the United States, England, the U.S.S.R., and France which adhered to them agreed to assist by joint efforts in the re-establishment of the unity of the German state, the creation of an all-German democratic government and the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany. The Government of the Soviet Union considers it necessary again to call the attention of the U.S. Government to the great importance for assuring European security by the observance of the principles and aims of the Potsdam agreement regarding Germany.

The Soviet Government still considers that only by the joint efforts of the Four Powers can European security be assured and can one prevent the re-establishment of aggressive German militarism toward which West German revanchists are striving. It is thus necessary for the United States, England, France, and the U.S.S.R., together with representatives of West and East Germany, to agree that, in accordance with the interests of strengthening peace and European security and the solution of this principle, there be no further delay in the decision concerning Germany and the problems connected therewith, i. e., the problems of a peace treaty with Germany and the re-establishment of the unity of a German state on democratic and peace-loving principles.

Namely by reason of the above considerations, the Soviet Government proposed to consider at a conference of Foreign Ministers such questions as: calling a peace conference to examine the question of a peace treaty with Germany, the creation of a provisional all-German Government, and the conduct of all-German elections.

In addition, the Soviet Government considered and considers it important to examine the question of lightening the financial-economic obligations of Germany connected with the consequences of war.

As before, in its note of October 18 the U.S. Government did not express its attitude toward these questions which have paramount significance for the solution of the German problem. Instead, it confines itself to a statement that in the conference under reference it would



utilize "the opportunity to put forward its views concerning questions dealt with in its previous notes."

This statement of the U.S. Government means that it, as before, seeks to limit consideration of the German problem to the question of all-German elections organized by the occupation authorities and not by the German people itself, inasmuch as the U.S. Government again evades considering the question of the immediate formation of an all-German democratic government. Moreover, until such an all-German government is formed, it is impossible to hold truly free all-German elections and to insure the solution of the basic tasks set by the Four Power Potsdam agreement, i. e., to assist in the re-establishment of Germany as a democratic and peace-loving state.

Moreover, it is impossible to consider the German problem independent of the other important problem directly relating to the security of Europe, i. e., the question of the situation which has arisen in connection with the ever-widening network of American military bases on the territories of certain European states. As the Soviet Government has already repeatedly stated, these military bases are being created principally in regions bordering the Soviet Union and countries of the Peoples' Democracies which, in itself, is evidence that these bases have nothing in common with the tasks of the defense of the countries participating in the North Atlantic bloc and are intended for use for aggressive ends. Such American bases have been established, as is well known, on the territories of England, France, Italy, Turkey, Norway, and a number of other countries. Only recently an agreement was concluded regarding the establishment of new American military bases on the territory of Greece, which has nothing in common with the national interests of the Greek people. How far the business of creating American military bases in Europe has gone is witnessed by the fact that recently an agreement was signed between the United States and the former accomplice of Hitlerite Germany, Franco Spain, which is becoming a military ally of the North Atlantic group of powers and is making its territory available for the establishment of American naval and air bases. In view of these new facts, no one can assert that the North Atlantic bloc serves defensive aims.

In addition, open pressure is being systematically put on certain other states of Europe and the Near East and Middle East and, in particular, on Iran to oblige them to make their territory available for foreign military bases despite legitimate protests from wide circles of the public in these countries who realize that establishment of such bases serves aggressive aims and is incompatible with the national sovereignty and independence of these countries.

Measures are being carried out now in the remilitarization of West Germany and directed toward turning the West German territory into a Place d'Armes for the preparation and the carrying out of the revanchist aims of the West German militarists and also the aggressive plans of the North Atlantic bloc have direct connection with the creation of the above-mentioned military bases.

It is not difficult to understand that, in such a situation when on the territory of a number of states of Europe, North Africa, the Near and Middle East are being organized more and more new foreign military bases and when plans are being carried out for the remilitarization of Western Germany, that a threat is being created to the

security of the Soviet Union as well as a number of other states which is leading to further aggravation of tension of the international situation and is increasing the threat of a new world war. All this indicates that a settlement of the German problem in conformity with the interests of guaranteeing European security is inextricably bound up with the decision of the question of the liquidation of these military bases. Any other attitude to this question would mean that the interests of genuine guaranty of European security are being ignored.

In connection therewith the Soviet Government would like to receive a clarification from the Government of the United States as well as from the Governments of England and France as to whether their statement on the willingness to consider the German question at a meeting of the Ministers of the Four Powers and their recognition of the importance of guaranteeing European security means that they will not place themselves in a position whereby on the one hand it is proposed to examine the German question at a conference and on the other simultaneously to adopt measures for the ratification of the Paris and the Bonn agreements by those states which have so far not ratified them. The receipt of such clarification is necessary in view of the fact that ratification of these agreements and their entry into force will make impossible the restoration of Germany as a unified state and thereby also render pointless the consideration of the German question at a meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Four Powers. Such a meeting would be bound in advance by agreed separate obligations of the Three Powers and the Bonn Government of Adenauer for inclusion of Western Germany in the North Atlantic bloc and the creation of a West German revanchist army. All that is said above shows that, given a genuine desire to settle urgent international problems, it is necessary to reach an understanding concerning the urgent consideration of measures for the reduction of tension in international relations and this requires the convocation of a conference of the Five Powers. It is possible to hope that the examination of the above-mentioned measures will facilitate also the decision of the German question which, as is evident, is inextricably bound up with the problem of guaranteeing of European security.

On the basis of the foregoing the Soviet Government reaffirms the proposal contained in its note of September 28 for the calling of a conference of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and at that meeting:

1. To examine measures for the reduction of tension in international relations with participation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the United States of America, England, France, the Chinese Peoples' Republic, and the Soviet Union;

2. To consider the German question, including all the proposals advanced during the course of the preparations for the conference with the participation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the United States of America, England, France, and the Soviet Union.

In connection with the question of an Austrian treaty mentioned by the Government of the United States of America, the Soviet Government considers it necessary to recall that it is awaiting the answer of the Government of the United States of America and also of the Governments of England and France to its note of August 28 on this question and notes that the discussion proposed by the Soviet Government of this question through normal diplomatic channels has not yet taken place.



## Anniversary of Recognition of Soviet Government

Press release 622 dated November 17

*Asked at his press conference on November 17 for comment on the twentieth anniversary of U.S. diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union, Secretary Dulles said:*

I believe that on balance over the 20-year period the United States has gained more than it has lost through recognition. The gain was particularly notable during the period of the Second World War when the Russians were our Allies, when the Red armies were fighting valiantly against a common enemy and when there was necessity for co-operation.

I might add, however, that there is a lesson to be learned from the fact that the original recognition was gained on the basis of false pretenses. The Soviets at that time made promises which they have not lived up to. For example, they promised that they would not tolerate any subversive activities against the United States.

We can, I think, usefully learn a lesson from that, which is, it is never prudent to trade performance on our part against promises on the part of the Soviet Communists.

## Freeing of Prisoners of War in Korea

*Press Conference Statement by Secretary Dulles*

Press release 621 dated November 17

There has been some inquiry as to the status of prisoners of war in Korea 120 days after they were turned over to the Repatriation Commission. The armistice<sup>1</sup> provisions are clear. All prisoners who have not chosen repatriation, and as to whom no other disposition has been agreed to by the Political Conference, shall be given their freedom after 120 days. This period ends January 22, 1954. Even if no Political Conference has been held by that time the prisoners on that date should receive their freedom.

Since the beginning of the POW discussion, the U.S. position has been consistently that POW's must not be forcibly repatriated or held indefinitely.

This was made clear and accepted by the United Nations when its resolution of December 3, 1952,<sup>2</sup> was under discussion. It was made clear to the Communists when armistice negotiations were resumed in the spring of 1953. This position was

finally accepted by the Communists in June 1953, although the Communists attempted to insert a provision which would have held the prisoners until final agreement by the Political Conference. The U.N. negotiators maintained their position that POW's should not be indefinitely held and the Communists finally accepted the U.N. position. The agreement thus confirms the consistent and firm position of the United States.

The relevant portion of paragraph 11 of the Terms of Reference for the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission,<sup>3</sup> annexed to the Armistice Agreement, reads:

The Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission shall declare the relief from the prisoner of war status to civilian status of any prisoners of war who have not exercised their right to be repatriated and for whom no other disposition has been agreed to by the Political Conference within one hundred and twenty (120) days after the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission has assumed their custody.

## Eric Johnston Reports on Near-East Talks

### White House Statement

White House press release dated November 17

Eric Johnston today reported to the President and the Secretary of State that the governments of the countries which he visited are studying with an open mind the far-reaching proposals outlined in the recent U.N. report on unified development of the water resources of the Jordan River Valley.<sup>4</sup>

The objective of Mr. Johnston's visit to these states as the President's personal representative was to lay the Jordan Valley report before them and to emphasize the importance which the Government of the United States attaches to it.

Since the proposals in the U.N. report involve political questions of great concern to the interested countries, as well as complicated technical problems, Mr. Johnston did not expect nor ask for decisions at this time. He asked the interested governments to consider the report carefully and indicated his intention of returning for more definitive discussions after they have had an opportunity to examine the proposals in detail. He received assurances that they would be given the most careful study preparatory to his return.

Mr. Johnston reported that the attitude he encountered gave him reason to believe that, after

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, June 22, 1953, p. 867.

<sup>4</sup> *Unified Development of the Water Resources of the Jordan Valley Region*, prepared at the request of the United Nations under the direction of the Tennessee Valley Authority by Charles T. Main, Inc.

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of AUG. 3, 1953, p. 132.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Dec. 8, 1952, p. 916.

serious scrutiny, the project will commend itself to the states concerned as a sound and constructive approach to some of the most critical issues contributing to present tensions in the area.

Acceptance of the proposals by the Jordan Valley states would not only go far toward resolving the highly controversial question of rights to the vital water of the River Jordan, but clear the way for the construction of irrigation and hydro-electric installations to provide an economic base in the Jordan Valley for upward of 300,000 people. This would offer an opportunity to settle a substantial number of the Arab refugees now living on international relief rolls in the Arab countries of the region. This problem was reported by the Secretary of State as one of great concern following his trip to the Middle Eastern areas last May.

The President has expressed his gratification to Mr. Johnston and has asked him to pursue this matter further with the Secretary of State. It is expected that Mr. Johnston will proceed to the Near East for further discussions in the near future.

#### **Press Conference Statement by the Secretary**

Press release 623 dated November 17

*At his press conference on November 17, Secretary Dulles made the following statement about the recent mission of Eric Johnston to the Near East as Personal Representative of the President:*

I am gratified by the report given by Mr. Johnston to the President and me. The development of the Jordan Valley, as proposed by the United Nations report, could, it seems, go far toward removing some of the most serious causes of tensions in the Near East. It offers a basis for rehabilitation of a substantial number of the Arab refugees and a settlement of rights to the waters of the Jordan.

The political situation which has currently developed in the area might well have resulted in an outright rejection of the ideas set out in the U.N. report. However, as a result of Mr. Johnston's presentations, the project is still very much alive, and we are hopeful of increasingly favorable consideration.

#### **Claims Against Former Ruling Family of Egypt**

Press release 619 dated November 17

*The following announcement, which was published in the Egyptian press on November 12, 1953, may be of interest to American persons or firms*

*having claims against the property of the former ruling family of Egypt:*

In execution of the decision of the Revolutionary Command Council on November 8, 1953, confiscating funds and property of members of the Mohamed Ali Family, and also funds and property acquired from them by others through inheritance, marriage, or relationship, the Confiscated Property Liquidation Committee informs persons owing money, be it contract, debts, rent, or otherwise, to persons on whom the confiscation decision applies, that they would refrain from settling any debt or effect any settlement, or hand over anything to anyone except to the Committee direct.

Said persons should furthermore inform the Committee within 1 month from the date of publication of this notice, of the amount they owe, and the date on which it falls due. On the other hand, any creditors to any of the persons whose property the Revolutionary Command Council decided to confiscate have to submit to the Committee their documents proving the debt not later than 1 month from the date of publication of this notice, so that the Committee may be able to register their claims.

#### **Claims Payment Made by Mexico**

Press release 631 dated November 19

The Mexican Ambassador to the United States, Manuel Tello, on November 19 presented to John M. Cabot, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, the Mexican Government's check for \$2,500,000, U.S. currency, representing the twelfth annual installment due to the United States under the Claims Convention concluded November 19, 1941.<sup>1</sup> The Assistant Secretary of State requested the Ambassador to convey to his Government an expression of this Government's appreciation.

Under the terms of the convention, Mexico agreed to pay the United States \$40,000,000, U.S. currency, in settlement of certain property and other claims of citizens of the United States against the Government of Mexico, as described in the convention. (Not included in the convention were claims based upon expropriation of petroleum properties and certain minor claims enumerated in the convention. Payment on the oil claims was completed in 1947.) Payments heretofore made amount to \$33,500,000. With the present payment of \$2,500,000 the balance remaining to be paid amounts to \$4,000,000 to be liquidated during the next 2 years.

<sup>1</sup> 56 Stat. 1347.

## The Importance of U.S.-Latin American Trade

by John M. Cabot

Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs<sup>1</sup>

Who isn't cheered by the aroma of a hot cup of coffee? How would our wheels of industry, and government, turn without it? Is it a pure coincidence that so many of the most advanced nations of the world have such a strong liking for it?

But coffee is a source of discord as well as pleasure. Between the producer who remembers dreary years of ruinous prices while surplus coffee was burned, and the consumer who finds the packaged coffee he is accustomed to using marked up again and again in recent years, there has unfortunately arisen considerable misunderstanding. That is regrettable because the interests of each require that there shall be an adequate supply at a fair price. It is doubly unfortunate because it tends to affect our hemispheric relations.

You are fully aware of the importance of coffee in our hemispheric trade relations. We import \$1.3 billion of it annually from our sister republics. It represents better than three-eighths of Latin America's total export trade. For some countries the percentage is much higher—80 percent or more in Colombia, El Salvador, and Guatemala, and over 70 percent in Brazil. In these countries coffee is the principal employer. A large proportion of the population is occupied either in the growing or the preparation of coffee, and their standard of living depends in large measure on the relative prosperity of the coffee trade. Without the exchange earned from sales of coffee, the producing countries would not be able to buy abroad the many things which they now import from the United States and from Europe.

Why, then, should misunderstanding have arisen in regard to the trade in such an important commodity?

The fundamental coffee problem is always the adjustment of supply to demand. Demand is subject to fluctuations of a cyclical character which are not entirely predictable and such fluctuations

are even greater on the supply than on the demand side. Also, the production cycle of coffee is a long one. It is, therefore, difficult to increase supplies rapidly in a period of rising demand. The reverse is also true. Since coffee trees, once planted, continue to produce for about 40 years, it is even more difficult to reduce production when demand declines.

Here in the United States the average citizen knows little or nothing about the coffee supply situation, coffee stocks in particular. Many are under the impression that there is still a surplus of coffee in Brazil and that the Brazilian Government is deliberately holding stocks off the market as a means of raising the price. Surprising as it may seem, letters have come to the State Department within the past 6 months from individuals in this country asking whether it was not true that Brazil was still burning coffee. Actually, as you know, world consumption of coffee has exceeded world production for the past several years. The excess of consumption over production has been supplied from stocks carried over from previous years, and these are now virtually exhausted.

There is also a misconception regarding the degree of control which producing countries can exercise over production and price. The fact that we tend to speak of "Latin America" as a unit contributes to this fallacy, I believe. We forget that there are 14 separate countries in the hemisphere exporting coffee, and thousands of individual producers in each, whose interests do not necessarily coincide. We assume that conflicting crop reports are an attempt on someone's part to influence prices. We have little conception of the difficulties involved in getting adequate statistical data in countries where communications are not always well developed, and producing areas are widely separated.

However, we in the United States have no monopoly on misconceptions, as those of you who have traveled south realize. There is a general belief in Latin America that we are not dealing fairly with them in the prices we pay for their

<sup>1</sup> Address made before the National Coffee Association at Boca Raton, Fla., on Nov. 16 (press release 616 dated Nov. 12).



commodities—that we buy their coffee, their metals and their raw materials at a relatively low price and that the prices we charge for manufactured goods are proportionately too high. Actually, the prices which the Latin American countries now receive for their exports in relation to the prices they pay for their imports is much more favorable to them than it was at the beginning of the Second World War, although the prices of some of Latin America's exports have declined during the past year. On the basis of 1939 prices equaling 100, the index of the prices of our exports to Latin America rose in 1952 to 192 but the index of the prices of our imports from Latin America rose to 400. The present level of coffee prices, especially, is favorable to the producing countries. Coffee prices are, in fact, in a favorable relationship not only to the prices of most of the goods which the coffee-producing countries import from the United States but to the prices of most other goods imported into the United States from Latin America. One of the reasons why this is not better understood in Latin America is the fact that inflationary prices within some of the coffee-producing countries have greatly increased the costs of producing coffee.

It is also at times alleged by Latin America that we are trying to thwart their efforts at industrialization, in order to assure ourselves of raw materials on the one hand and markets on the other.

#### **Aid to Latin American Industry**

The fact is that this is the exact reverse of the truth. We have steadily sought to promote the industrialization of Latin America. Since the Export-Import Bank was established in 1934, it has made loan commitments to Latin American countries of more than \$2 billion of which considerably more than one-half has been committed since 1945. Our Technical Cooperation Program has contributed substantially to this same objective. In this way we have not only aided in providing basic facilities to encourage industrialization, but also have cooperated in building up great industries such as the Volta Redonda Steel Mill in Brazil. We have also looked with favor on the investment of American private capital in Latin America. In substantial measure, the enormous progress of Latin America in industrialization in recent years has been due to our positive cooperation.

— We have cooperated in the industrialization programs of our sister republics precisely because we believe that it is in our interest as well as theirs to cooperate in them. We feel that it is no accident that our total trade with them has increased in value from \$1.0 billion in 1939 to \$6.9 billion in 1952 and in volume about 2½ times. The rapid development of our sister republics, far from

harming the market for American goods, has vastly increased it. The rapid development of Latin America's facilities and natural resources has not only helped Latin America to industrialize and to supply new industries, but also has provided increased materials for our industrial machine.

We have, moreover, a definite national interest in stable, prosperous, and strong neighbors in this hemisphere with expanding economies and rising living standards. We appreciate the growing importance of the sturdy young nations of this hemisphere in maintaining world peace and resisting aggression from whatever quarter it may come. We know that nations in which conditions are economically and socially sound are not likely to succumb to the hypocritical promises of Communist agitators. In short, it is important for us, for political as well as economic reasons, that our sister republics develop their economies along sound lines as rapidly as they can.

— I wish to congratulate the National Coffee Association on the theme which you have chosen for this year's convention, "The Challenge Facing Coffee." It is heartening to see an industry facing up so directly to its problems. One of these problems, I am sure, is the misunderstanding regarding the present coffee situation both in the United States and in Latin America. It is my hope that this convention may help to lessen that misunderstanding. The members of the National Coffee Association appear to me to be in a particularly favorable position for interpreting their fellow citizens to the producing countries and for explaining producer problems to consumers in the United States, which is now almost synonymous with the body politic. You know the problems. You have the contacts. You have excellent press coverage. You are therefore admirably situated to serve as moderators when differences arise, and you can do much to correct each group's perspective on the problems of the other.

There are a number of reasons why it is important to clarify our problems in Latin America and avoid misunderstandings, both from the standpoint of the coffee industry and from the broader standpoint of foreign relations. From the trade standpoint, as you know, developments which result in material unfairness to producers, or consumers, will correct themselves in the long run, and in the process any temporary advantage which has accrued to either party may be more than offset with the reverse swing of the pendulum. The trade is too fragmented on both sides for either to expect to reap any long-run advantage at the expense of the other. But there is a risk that a lack of comprehension of basic economic laws may do as much damage as actual market manipulation by retarding necessary adjustments.

If we in the United States encourage consumer



strikes against coffee on the assumption that it will bring down the price, we may, in fact, reduce prices temporarily. But if the high price is a reflection of rising labor costs, we may find that labor is being attracted out of coffee production into some other field and that, as supply falls off, prices go higher than they were before. Similarly, producing countries which take the position that price must, willy-nilly, be kept at a figure which covers the cost of production of their least efficient producers may damage their own interests more than those of the consumer. If prices are supported at levels which are unrealistic in terms of competitive costs in other countries, regardless of the cost situation in the price-supporting country, it will not be long before lower cost producers are increasing their plantings and taking over a larger share of the market. Corrections always take place over the long run, but, the longer the period of readjustment, the more drastic it will be, the greater the resentment engendered and the more difficult the reconciliation of viewpoints. It would be better if the consumer could appraise the situation correctly in the first instance and not have to do without his coffee. It would be better if the producer could be made aware, at the outset, of the competitive risks involved in policies which lead to overplanting and, eventually, to surplus. The coffee industry will be healthier, producers, dealers, and roasters included, if excessive fluctuations in price can be avoided.

Looking now beyond the coffee trade's own interests, we have an interest as a government in maximizing our trade in coffee with Latin America and in avoiding misunderstandings of every sort. Misunderstanding and mistrust, given the existing international situation, can retard the economic progress of the hemisphere, undermine our solidarity and even threaten our joint security.

#### Coffee and Economic Progress

First, consider the importance of an expanding coffee trade to the hemisphere's economic progress. Latin America is in the midst of a tremendous economic expansion. It has magnificent undeveloped resources; it has a rapidly growing population; and it has the ambition to develop its resources and to raise the standard of living of its people in the shortest possible space of time. It is to our interest as well as theirs that its productive capacity be increased. What it lacks is capital. Young countries, like young people, do not have large savings to draw upon and must rely on current income to obtain the capital goods and equipment which they need. That current income must be obtained, in large measure, in a good many countries, from coffee. It is the one big cash crop. Even today, with coffee prices at the high-

est level they have ever reached, some producing countries are in a difficult foreign-exchange position—not because they are not basically solvent, but because it takes time for investments to begin to produce income. If the coffee industry should suffer a serious depression, not only would it intensify existing balance-of-payments problems, but it would retard the flow of new capital into the area and delay investments in basic facilities which are already overdue.

Most of these countries are in serious need of increased electric power, of better transportation facilities, of more warehouses, of all kinds of improvements that are fundamental to their future growth. They can obtain a part of the capital they require by borrowing, but a major part must be supplied out of the proceeds of their export trade. Even their ability to borrow is in large measure contingent on their ability to meet interest charges, and in many countries this means ability to sell their coffee. I have noted a growing awareness in Latin America lately of the need for expanding exports of agricultural products and encouraging, or at least not discouraging, production of those commodities in which these countries have a clear comparative advantage.

There is evidence of a waning enthusiasm on the part of some governments for industrialization at any cost, and a more realistic approach to development problems. As the difficulties of meeting increasing exchange obligations with a limited exchange availability become more apparent, the need grows for examining each new investment in terms of the contribution it can make to balancing the exchange account as well as of the long-run contribution which it can make to general economic development. Regardless of the availability of foreign capital, domestic capital must take primary responsibility for each country's future development and for the elevation of living standards, and if it is to do this successfully, its basic export industries must be kept in healthy condition.

In stressing, as I have, the extent to which misconceptions are responsible for our problems, both in trade and in politics, I do not mean to imply that full knowledge and a frank discussion will always resolve the issues. But it should, at a minimum, serve to develop tolerance, both on our part and on theirs, as we observe over the years that neither of us was invariably right. There are relatively few problems which admit of only one solution. We should never fail to seek the broader view, and the coffee problem is but one of many to which I refer. It illustrates many of the obstacles we face in seeking to promote the unity of purpose in this hemisphere that is vital to the security of all of the American Republics. The apparent conflict of interest between the coffee producer in Latin America and the consumer in the United States is in fact a common interest

which should advance us on the path of our common destiny.

### A Definition of Democracy

Cordell Hull once defined democracy as the right to differ. Surely that is the meaning of nationality and sovereignty in the modern world; that nations with diverse heritages, philosophies, and capacities may seek to work out national problems in the differing ways their respective national geniuses may suggest. In the free world cooperation between nations rests on consent, not coercion. We are prepared to cooperate with any nation which fulfills its international responsibilities, and for that reason we do cooperate with nations showing the greatest political, economic, and social diversities. That is precisely our quarrel with the Soviet Union, for it seeks to impose the sterile uniformity of its Communist tyranny on all of us.

At Yalta, Stalin insisted that any nation which wished to get an invitation to the San Francisco conference had to prove it was peace loving by declaring war on the Axis. Today there are respected voices raised in the United States to say that in order to promote hemispheric solidarity we should quarrel with those sister republics in this hemisphere which do not choose to mold themselves in our image. There are respected voices in Latin America which have joined in shortsighted clamor against the United States. In any foreign-policy job there is never any lack of excellent reasons for quarreling if one so chooses. Nevertheless, I conceive it to be the task of diplomacy to avoid quarrels rather than to promote them, to find means of reducing international frictions rather than of increasing them. Is it not curious that the returning war hero is greeted with tumultuous parades, while the diplomat who avoids an unnecessary war, or resolutely turns from the road leading to one, is greeted with a yawn if not pilloried in the press? Surely it is better to avoid unnecessary wars than to win them, and unnecessary quarrels often lead to unnecessary wars.

I question whether we shall promote unity and understanding in the free world by screaming imprecations at each other whenever we happen to disagree. We shall, of course, have our disagreements in the Americas. Does any family agree about everything? Let us never forget, however, the bonds of sentiment and interest which bind the American family of nations together and let us disagree without a public brawl. Does it mean nothing to us in the United States that, as we have loyally sought to strengthen the family bonds with our sister American Republics, some of the voices raised against us have been stilled? If we unnecessarily goad other American voices to speak in strident discord with ours, can we expect to get across our vital messages to our sister republics, and to the world?

If the voice of the American Republics is to be strong, clear and inspiring to the peoples of the world who long for peace and security but do not find it, it must not rise in snarling dissonance; it must be lifted up in confidence and harmony in order that the rest of the world may know that we have found better ways of solving international disputes than by throwing hydrogen bombs on each other; that justice, not might, makes right; that strong and weak can live together in mutual respect and cooperate with mutual benefit.

Four weeks ago today I was privileged to be present at the dedication of the Falcón Dam by President Ruiz Cortines and President Eisenhower. The ceremonies were held in an atmosphere of unalloyed cordiality and friendship. As the two Presidents stood side by side directly on the frontier while the honors were rendered, each before the plaque he had unveiled, I must confess I was deeply moved. Relations between Mexico and the United States have not always been as friendly as they are today. It seemed to me that each President was not only proud to be representing his own nation, but was proud, too, to clasp the other's hand at this significant international ceremony—to underline to the world what friendly international cooperation can accomplish. How infinitely better that nations should build a dam which will benefit them both, rather than two forts to protect themselves each from the other! No beacon that all the generators of Falcón could ever light could be brighter than this one that two American republics have lit to illuminate further the path into the future in world affairs. Once again the New World has blazed a trail. From that path we must never permit ourselves to be led astray by our unessential differences. Let us follow it in friendship and confidence, guided by the splendor of our Pan American concepts.

### Import Duties on Brier Pipes

White House press release dated November 10

In identical letters to Senator Eugene D. Millikin, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and Representative Daniel A. Reed, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the President on November 10 declined to accept the recommendation of the United States Tariff Commission for certain increases in duties on low-priced brierwood pipes.

On February 18, 1953, the President made an interim report to the Congress stating that he was requesting certain additional facts from the Tariff Commission regarding the brier pipe case before reaching a final decision.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Mar. 2, 1953, p. 354.

In his letter to Senator Millikin and Representative Reed, the President stated that he has now reviewed the supplemental report of the Tariff Commission<sup>2</sup> and has concluded that the primary cause of the industry's difficulty does not appear, in his opinion, to be imports from abroad, but rather a shift in consumer preference away from pipe-smoking. He does not believe, therefore, that an increase in the duty on brierwood pipes, as recommended by the Tariff Commission under the "Escape Clause" provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, would "remedy such deterioration as has taken place in the domestic industry."

#### Text of the President's Letter

NOVEMBER 10, 1953

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On February 18, 1953, I made an interim report to the Congress with regard to an application by representatives of the domestic brier pipe industry for an investigation of the imports of brierwood pipes and bowls. Representatives of the domestic industry had contended that these imports were occurring in increased quantities and were causing or threatening to cause serious injury to the domestic industry. Accordingly, they had asked for relief under Section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended.

Subsequently, the Tariff Commission had conducted an investigation and had recommended certain increases in duties on low-priced brierwood pipes. However, on an independent review of the available facts, I felt that the record was incomplete in some respects and I requested the Tariff Commission to furnish certain additional facts regarding the brier pipe case.

I have now reviewed the Tariff Commission's supplemental report submitted in response to my request of February 18. The report has proved most helpful in clarifying the factual issues relating to the case.

Since 1947, the domestic pipe industry has shown an overall deterioration. This industry consisted, in April 1953, of 13 concerns employing more than 5 production workers each, and employing in the aggregate 1,225 persons. As the Tariff Commission's report points out, this represents a marked decline from wartime and immediate postwar employment levels. This deterioration is further reflected by decreased volume of production, closing down of a number of plants, and poor profit experience of some of those producers remaining in operation. This development was due partly to the unloading on the market by the government of several million pipes

from its war surplus stocks following World War II. However, the same period has seen the return to the American market of foreign suppliers. Like many other imports which had disappeared during the war, brier pipes from abroad returned in steadily increasing volume from 1947 to 1951, finally reaching levels higher than before the war.

The Tariff Commission, in pursuance of its mandate under Section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act, found that this revival of imports had contributed to the decline of the domestic industry and that part of the responsibility was attributable to the tariff treatment accorded the brier pipe industry under the Trade Agreements Act.

Under the existing law, the Tariff Commission must make recommendations for remedial action when it finds that a domestic industry is being seriously injured by increased imports resulting "in whole or in part" from the existing customs treatment under a trade agreement. The law, however, lays upon the President the responsibility of weighing these recommendations and of making a final determination on the basis of them. Reasons of public policy or national interest which lie beyond the scope of the Tariff Commission's field of inquiry may, from time to time, enter into this final judgment of the Commission's findings: or the effect of a tariff concession on a given industry may be deemed of such little consequence that an increase in the duty would not substantially improve the situation.

In the present case, the primary cause of the domestic industry's difficulty appears to be a shift in consumer preference. This is indicated by the fact that total annual sales in the United States of brierwood pipes have fallen off from a peak of 20.7 million in 1948 to 14 million in 1952. Since the increase in annual imports of brier pipes during the period was less than 2 million, it seems apparent that the major part of this loss has been due to decline in consumer demand. Strong evidence for this view is also provided by the sharp decrease in domestic consumption of pipe tobacco in recent years. It is significant, too, that the latest estimates indicate that the decline in pipe sales in this country has continued into the first half of 1953. In other words, in recent years there has been a clear and sharp decrease in pipe-smoking in this country.

In view of the foregoing facts, I am not persuaded that the industry's difficulty is due primarily to increased imports under the existing trade agreement rates nor that the application of the Tariff Commission's recommendations under the "escape clause" procedure would remedy such deterioration as has taken place in the domestic industry. Accordingly I have decided not to act upon the Tariff Commission's recommendation to increase the duty on brierwood pipes.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

<sup>2</sup> Copies of the Tariff Commission's report on the brier pipe case and of the supplemental report may be obtained from the United States Tariff Commission, Washington 25, D. C.



## Mission of USIA Defined

White House press release dated October 28

### Statement by the President

In carrying out its responsibilities in accordance with pertinent statutes and Presidential directives, the United States Information Agency [USIA] shall be guided by the following:

1. The purpose of the United States Information Agency shall be to submit evidence to peoples of other nations by means of communication techniques that the objectives and policies of the United States are in harmony with and will advance their legitimate aspirations for freedom, progress and peace.

2. The purpose in paragraph 1 above is to be carried out primarily:

- a. By explaining and interpreting to foreign peoples the objectives and policies of the United States Government.

- b. By depicting imaginatively the correlation between United States policies and the legitimate aspirations of other peoples of the world.

- c. By unmasking and countering hostile attempts to distort or to frustrate the objectives and policies of the United States.

- d. By delineating those important aspects of the life and culture of the people of the United States which facilitate understanding of the policies and objectives of the Government of the United States.

### Letter to the President From Theodore C. Streibert, United States Information Agency Director

OCTOBER 27, 1953

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On August 1 of this year, by authority of your Reorganization Plan No. 8<sup>1</sup> approved by the Congress, the United States Information Agency came into being as a separate independent agency reporting to you through the National Security Council.

The operations of the Agency—embracing among others the Voice of America, the U. S. Libraries overseas, the motion picture service, and the press and publications service—were all formerly activities of the Department of State. We receive daily foreign policy guidance from the Secretary of State.

Since August 1, we have been engaged in organizing the Agency under the new set-up and reprogramming our activities within the limitations of the present appropriation. The new statement of mission for the Agency, adopted at last week's meeting of the National Security Council, is a great stride forward. It is of supreme importance to us—and indeed to the American people—because it clearly defines the broad lines within

which, I am convinced, our overseas information service can do an effective job.

It reflects the recommendations of the Senate's Special Subcommittee on Overseas Information Programs chaired by Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper of Iowa, which proposed on June 15, 1953, certain changes to strengthen the foreign information program.

It also embodies the concept of the President's Committee on International Information Activities (William H. Jackson Committee).<sup>2</sup> This concept is that psychological activities and psychological strategy do not exist apart from official policies and actions.

Under this new mission, avoiding a propagandistic tone, the Agency will emphasize the community of interest that exists among freedom-loving peoples and show how American objectives and policies advance the legitimate interests of such peoples.

We shall therefore concentrate on objective, factual news reporting and appropriate commentaries, designed to present a full exposition of important United States actions and policies, especially as they affect individual countries and areas.

In presenting facts we shall see to it that they are not distorted and that their selection does not misrepresent a given situation.

We shall make sure that the tone and content of our material is forceful and direct, but we shall avoid a strident or antagonistic note.

This does not, of course, preclude us from making forceful, factual refutations of false accusations such as those that come from the Soviet communist portion of the world.

The new approach will be harder hitting than previous more diffuse approaches because it is based on the idea of getting across a message that will be convincing. Facts, and comment associated with facts, are more compelling than accusations and unsupported assertions on a wide variety of issues.

From here on the Agency will pinpoint its activities on fewer but more vital programs.

As pointed out by the Jackson Committee, the American people share fundamental beliefs and values with millions of other men and women we are attempting to win to our side, which should be made clear to other peoples. These include belief in a Deity, in individual and national freedom, in the right to ownership of property and a decent standard of living, in the common humanity of all men, and in the vision of a peaceful world with nations compromising their differences and co-operating in the United Nations.

We must make every effort to show the mutuality of our interests and goals with legitimate

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of June 15, 1953, p. 854.

<sup>2</sup> For a summary of the Committee's report, see *ibid.*, July 27, 1953, p. 124.

goals of other peoples. We must explain those goals in ways that will cause other peoples to join with us in achieving them.

I am also pleased that under these more clearly defined objectives there will be greater opportunity for us to use the resources of patriotic private American business and non-Governmental groups in support of the information program. Private groups have given splendid support in the past, and we plan an intensive drive to further increase this support and thus multiply the effectiveness of the program.

The content of the new directive has been transmitted to all our posts in 77 countries throughout the world, so that they may have the immediate benefit of this guidance.

## **Inclusion of Atrocities Item on General Assembly Agenda**

*Statements by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.  
U.S. Representative to the General Assembly<sup>1</sup>*

U.S. delegation press release dated November 2

The U.S. delegation requested on October 30 that there be included in the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly an item entitled "Question of Atrocities Committed by the North Korean and Chinese Communist Forces Against U.N. Prisoners of War in Korea." In compliance with Rule 20 of the Rules of Procedure, I submitted an Explanatory Memorandum on this proposal.<sup>2</sup>

The relevance and importance of this subject in the General Assembly rests on a clear historical record. The many thousands of atrocities which have been uncovered were committed against armed forces acting under the U.N. Unified Command—acting pursuant to a mandate from the United Nations to repel aggression in Korea and restore international peace and security in the area. In addition, atrocities were committed against the civilian population in Korea. The authors of these atrocities were the same North Korean and Chinese Communist armed forces against whose aggressive action the United Nations forces were fighting.

Evidence of the commission of these atrocities began to appear in the late summer of 1950, after the U.N. forces, in their advance from the Pusan perimeter, overran the rear areas of the enemy. Further atrocities were discovered after the first Chinese Communist offensive had been repelled in the spring of 1951.

This evidence continued to be collected all during the 3-year course of the hostilities. Delay in official publication of the evidence until the present time was due, first, to our wish to include the additional and corroborating evidence which could only come from returning U.N. prisoners after their repatriation; secondly, to the thought that premature publication of these reports might jeopardize repatriation of some of our forces in Communist hands; and, lastly, because, after these individuals had been repatriated and had reported, time was required for careful evaluation and review of their reports, and of all other evidence obtained, by qualified authorities.

In view of this record, and in view of the concern of the U.N. for observance of international standards of civilized conduct, this question of atrocities against U.N. forces is properly and necessarily a matter of concern to the General Assembly. This would be so even if the atrocities had been committed exclusively against members of the armed forces of my country. It is true all the more since a large proportion of the victims belonged not only to the armed forces and civilian population of the Republic of Korea, whose territory had been violated by the aggression, but also in many cases to military units of other member nations which were fighting loyally as components of the United Nations Unified Command.

I therefore urge, Madam Chairman, that this item be included in the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly.<sup>3</sup>

I just wish to speak for a few minutes, and I intend to keep within the spirit of your injunction and confine myself to arguing that this is an important enough matter to go on the agenda so that the merits can be dealt with there. I will not try to deal with the merits here today.

It is really deplorable that Mr. Vyshinsky should argue against putting this on the agenda. His contention that there is not enough material is disproven simply by looking at this document, which is an extract of material from the *Interim Historical Report, War Crimes Division, Judge Advocate's Section, Korean Communication Zone, cumulative to June 30, 1953*. This material has been published—most of it has—and it certainly shows there is a great deal of material, certainly plenty to justify putting it on the agenda.

Madam President, in doing this, we do not consider that we are, in Mr. Vyshinsky's words, introducing a complication to peace. If we thought we were doing that, we would not be doing what we are today. Our action is not adding any difficulty at all to the talks going on at Panmunjom. We

<sup>1</sup> Made on Nov. 2 in the General Committee.

<sup>2</sup> BULLETIN of Nov. 16, 1953, p. 685.

<sup>3</sup> The General Committee on Nov. 2 decided by a vote of 12-2 (Poland, U. S. S. R.), with no abstentions, to recommend inclusion of the item.

do not believe that human affairs can be conducted on the basis of suppressing the truth, or on the basis of ignoring evil, or that anything sound or good or lasting can be built on the basis of sweeping things under the rug as though they hadn't happened. We believe that something is owed to the memory of the tragic victims of these atrocities and that simply to allow their suffering to pass into oblivion is not right. In the larger sense, therefore, what we are doing is in the interests of peace and in the interests of better human relations in the future.

#### Statement in Plenary Session

U.S. delegation press release dated November 11

On October 30, the United States requested that there be included in the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly an item entitled "Question of Atrocities Committed by the North Korean and Chinese Communist Forces Against United Nations Prisoners of War in Korea." On the following day, in accordance with the rules of procedure, I submitted an explanatory memorandum on this proposed agenda item. This memorandum, and my oral statement to the General Committee, noted the accumulation of evidence that atrocities had been committed by the aggressor forces in Korea against many thousands of captured military personnel of the United Nations Unified Command, representing several national contingents, as well as against the civilian population of Korea.

Let it be repeated that it has only recently become possible to present anything like a complete and balanced picture of the atrocities and other wrongful acts which the aggressor forces committed. The evidence accumulated by United States military authorities in Korea during the three years of warfare had to be carefully analyzed and evaluated. Furthermore, it was necessary to await the repatriation of our surviving prisoners of war, following the armistice, in order to receive their testimony corroborating and adding to the information we already had.

There are herewith submitted four fundamental reasons why the General Assembly should consider this evidence and its implications.

The first reason is the simple fact that the acts in question were committed by forces engaged in an act of military aggression, so recognized by the United Nations.

The second reason is that the acts in question were committed against the military forces which the United Nations sent to repel that aggression, as well as against the people of the country which the aggressors were trying to conquer.

The third reason is that these acts by their very nature, mass murder and many other heinous acts,

are of a character which grossly violates principles of common humanity and decency. Such principles, in fact, are so basic that their observance in war itself has been agreed to in solemn conventions having the force of international law. To the extent that the United Nations is interested in the observance of such principles, and specifically in the observance of international law, we submit that on this ground alone it could not well ignore the history of their wholesale violation by the aggressor forces in Korea.

The fourth reason is that the forces which committed these acts still stand today, fully mobilized, and fully armed, north of the demilitarized zone in Korea. Thus we must recognize, in the midst of our prayers and labors for genuine peace, that this story of inhuman warfare is not brought out of a forgotten past but bears directly on the pressing problems of the present.

For these reasons, Madam President, I urge that this item be included in the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly.\*

#### U.S. Objective in Discussion of "Germ Warfare" Charges

*Statement by Henry Ford II*

*U.S. Representative to the General Assembly\**

U.S. delegation press release dated November 3

The objective of the United States in the discussion of this item was to bring the truth before the world so that these dreadful things would never happen again. Two main events have taken place since the General Assembly last April passed its resolution calling for an impartial investigation of the charges of use by the United Nations forces of bacteriological warfare. The first event was that the Republic of Korea and Japan indicated their acceptance of the investigation. The Chinese and North Korean Communists did not reply to the communication of the President of the Seventh General Assembly on this subject. The second event related to certain materials introduced by the Soviet Union in connection with the debate on this item in the Seventh General Assembly. I am referring to the so-called "confessions" of six American fliers that they had waged bacteriological warfare over North Korea and China.

These fliers had been repatriated and had indicated their so-called "confessions" were obtained

\* Inclusion of the item on the agenda of the General Assembly was agreed upon on Nov. 11 by a vote of 53-5 (Soviet bloc) -2.

\* Made in plenary session on Nov. 3.



under coercion and torture. My Government brought this to the attention of the Committee and also indicated to the Committee the significance of the entire bacteriological warfare campaign in relation to the general political tactics of worldwide Communist imperialism.<sup>6</sup>

Since the resolution of the Seventh General Assembly is still operative, my Government saw no occasion for any further resolution on the subject. An impartial investigation can be conducted pursuant to that resolution, any time that the Chinese or North Korean Communists indicate their willingness to cooperate.

The Soviet Union, however, introduced into the Committee discussion a resolution<sup>7</sup> calling upon all states which have not acceded to or ratified the Geneva Protocol of June 17, 1925, for the "prohibition of use of bacteriological weapons to accede to the Protocol or ratify it." This Soviet resolution was properly described in the Committee as a "red herring," totally irrelevant to the question which the Committee was discussing. It was pointed out that the sole motive of the action of the Soviet Union was to cast an aspersion on my Government and thus divert attention from a debate which it could not win.

The Governments of the United Kingdom, Canada, Colombia, France, and New Zealand introduced into the Committee, and the Committee accepted, a proposal<sup>8</sup> to refer to the Disarmament Commission the draft resolution of the Soviet Union. My Government supported this resolution in the Committee and will vote for it today. The entire question of the elimination of bacteriological warfare as well as of other major weapons of mass destruction properly belongs in the Disarmament Commission. The Soviet Union has reintroduced into the General Assembly the same resolution which it presented to the Committee. The adoption by this Assembly of the resolution approved in the Committee in the view of my Government will make unnecessary a vote on the Soviet resolution.

I sincerely hope that the debate on this matter has established to the satisfaction of all members of the General Assembly that these frightful charges of the use of bacteriological warfare by U.N. forces in Korea are totally unfounded and are false. I further hope that all states will consider thoroughly the significance of such a campaign of falsehood in relation to the broader subject of the political tensions now engulfing the world.

## Continuation of Assistance to Arab Refugees

*Statement by James P. Richards*

*U.S. Representative to the General Assembly<sup>1</sup>*

U.S. delegation press release dated November 4

My delegation has examined the report of the Acting Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and the recommendations of the Acting Director and the Advisory Commission on the measures which should be taken by the Assembly in the difficult and protracted problems of the Arab refugees from Palestine.<sup>2</sup> We are pleased to be able to cosponsor a resolution<sup>3</sup> which is designed to continue the measures of assistance to the refugees which have been initiated by the General Assembly in the past and which have justly received such widespread support from the international community.

We are especially gratified that Egypt, Jordan, and Syria, states so directly concerned with the refugee problem, have joined the Advisory Commission of the UNRWA in the past year. The counsel of their representatives has been of great assistance to the Agency in the conduct of its difficult operations. I am certain that their assistance will be of continued value to the UNRWA. My delegation has also been glad to note the interest of the Republic of Lebanon in joining the Commission and in adding weight and support to the Agency's program looking to the improvement of living conditions of the refugees and to the time when much larger numbers of the refugees can become self-supporting.

The problem of the Palestine refugees is complex. The reasons for their plight, their present difficulties, and their future all are intertwined in the web of the economics and politics of the Near East. It is therefore important that we should separate out clearly in our thinking those issues which now concern this Committee in dealing with the specific item on our agenda and the specific resolution which we are considering. Mr. Chairman, if we do this, and clearly realize what is relevant at this time, discarding irrelevancies, we can make progress in alleviating the lot of the refugees and in rehabilitating many thousands of them. It is important to limit, on this occasion, our topics to those of economic and humanitarian considerations. We must recall that the UNRWA necessarily operates within a political framework which is not of its own making. Fortunately, the

<sup>6</sup>For text of Dr. Charles W. Mayo's statement in Committee I, see BULLETIN of Nov. 9, 1953, p. 641.

<sup>7</sup>U.N. doc. A/C.1/L.67.

<sup>8</sup>U.N. doc. A/C.1/L.68. The resolution was adopted by Committee I on Oct. 31 by a vote of 47-0-13 and by the General Assembly on Nov. 3 by a vote of 47-0-12. The Soviet draft was not put to a vote in either the Committee or the plenary session.

<sup>1</sup>Made on Nov. 4 in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

<sup>2</sup>U. N. docs. A/2470 and A/2470/Add. 1.

<sup>3</sup>U. N. doc. A/C. 72/L. 12, sponsored by France, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The Committee adopted the resolution on Nov. 12 by a vote of 46-0-5 (Soviet bloc).

text of the draft resolution which is before us presents in clear and precise terms the essentials of present concern to this Committee.

In the first place, the resolution in its preamble establishes once more the appropriate setting for the UNRWA operations. Its assistance to the Arab refugees in no way prejudices the rights of the refugees.

In the second place, the resolution calls for a continuation of the Agency's mandate for another year—an essential legislative act if the UNRWA is to continue its life beyond June 30, 1954.

In the third place, the resolution sets a goal for the relief operations of the Agency for the current fiscal year and enables relief operations to continue in the ensuing fiscal year.

In the fourth place, the resolution continues the availability of the project fund of \$200 million, established at the Sixth Session of the Assembly, until June 30, 1955.

In the fifth place, the resolution requests the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds to obtain from governments the contributions necessary to meet the Agency's needs, which have proved to be larger than the requirements forecast in January 1952, when the General Assembly established the 3-year program of relief and rehabilitation.

In the sixth place, the resolution authorizes an increase in the membership of the Advisory Commission. We gladly support this proposal. My delegation is aware, however, of the delicate balance necessarily existing between the management of an operating agency of UNRWA's character and its board of advisers; it may well prove that to expedite the daily operations of the Agency it will be best for the Advisory Commission to concern itself primarily with broad policy in consultation with the Director of the Agency.

Mr. Chairman, my Government is increasingly concerned with the magnitude of the refugee problem and the delays in finding measures to solve it in whole or in part. It is my duty to make our position clear to all concerned at this time. It would be no kindness to the refugees, nor to the Near Eastern countries so deeply concerned with this problem, if I now leave unsaid those things which will, in the opinion of my delegation, affect the future policy of the United States.

The United States is not prepared, in the opinion of my delegation, and in the words of one of our congressional committees which considered the problem at length during the past summer, "to bear indefinitely so large a share of the burden involved in this situation when Israel and the Arab States show so little initiative in helping to settle the matter among themselves. There is a very real danger that the longer the United States continues to supply relief money, the less desire there will be on the part of the states in the area to make real efforts on their own to liquidate the problem."

It is with a background of continuous support in the past, however, that my delegation now looks to the countries of the area, which are primarily concerned and which have primary responsibility, for constructive solutions.

My delegation has noted with interest the four program agreements concluded during the year with Egypt, Libya, Jordan, and Syria, as indicative of cooperation with the UNRWA program. Progress in carrying out specific projects of benefit to the refugees will be followed with great interest. We believe that a determined effort to turn these prospects into realities can be of the greatest benefit to all the peoples of the Near East and of the free world. Continuation of substantial contributions to the UNRWA program will, inevitably, be determined by the progress which is made in the months ahead.

We also believe that the interests of both the Palestine refugees and of Israel herself make it important for Israel to take further steps with a minimum of delay in discharge of the responsibilities she has accepted for compensating the Palestine refugees, and that Israel would be well advised to renew consideration of the responsibility for and the possibilities of repatriation.

Ready as the United States and other nations abroad may be to help with services and funds, the programs so far proposed cannot hope to solve the problem for more than the 320,000 refugees who would be rendered self-supporting, as estimated in the Acting Director's report. No programs are yet under consideration for the remaining 500,000. We look for a real disposition, both in the Arab States and in Israel, to take bold and statesmanlike measures to assure the success of the programs now envisaged and of others which must be developed.

The governments of these countries are well aware of the following facts, as they most certainly apply to many hundreds of thousands of the refugees. No government can speak authoritatively on behalf of the refugees as a whole. They have lost their homes, their possessions, and in most cases their livelihood, and have been paid no compensation in exchange. Few have thus far been permitted to return to their homes. They are in most instances unable to find work in the countries which give them shelter, for a variety of reasons. Many thousands are living in temporary shelter, founded by UNRWA, close to the borders of Israel.

In such a situation may be found the basis of eternal hates and the seeds of future wars.

Only in a spirit of compassion can the problems of the refugees, as well as other associated problems in that area, be solved. Only by an exhibition of this spirit can the parties involved reasonably expect the United Nations to continue to pour out money in direct relief; only by the spirit of give and take, if you please, in a world grown very

small in recent years and ever more conscious of things of the spirit, can any nation or any people expect the permanent blessing of our Creator or the confidence of mankind.

In the light of these facts, how can UNRWA hope to assist many, many thousands of those refugees to earn their livelihood unless real and immediate progress is made toward the maximum utilization of local resources?

Is it not possible, as a start, to solve the problem of the Jordan waters on the basis of equity and economy, dedicating a fair share of the benefits which could be thus obtained to those refugees who chose to settle in the Jordan's watershed? In order to be fully informed on the potentials of the development of the Jordan, the UNRWA has sought and secured the best engineering advice. The report recently released on the unified development of the Jordan Valley is one which must command the most thoughtful and careful consideration. Its significance is such that all of the governments concerned should study it from the standpoint of vital economic interests of their own peoples and of the refugees. It highlights a basic problem which must be squarely faced. Methods and procedures for dealing with the facts brought out in this study will need to be evolved when the significance of these facts has been fully understood.

The United States Government believes that the suggestions in this report are sound and well considered. We hope that other governments concerned will share our conviction and seek the adjustments that could make this plan work.

The problems involved in the use of international rivers are not new. Although circumstances in other parts of the world are very different, I hope I may be permitted to refer to our own experiences. This month there has been completed on the Rio Grande the great Falcón Dam;<sup>4</sup> its planning, finance, construction, and utilization are the results of joint agreements worked out through patient negotiation and in a spirit of give and take. Its benefits to the peoples of Mexico on one side of the river and to the peoples of the United States on the other will be great. This great work could never have been achieved without the basic concern of the peoples and Governments of both countries in the improvement of the resources with which nature had endowed them. Granted this desire to make the best uses of a great river, ways and means were worked out to reconcile the conflicting interests in this watershed. The same thing can be done elsewhere if there is a will to do it.

This is a time for decision in the Near East. May those charged with the responsibility for its future welfare move forward, in a spirit of conciliation, armed with wisdom, good temper, and good hope. We stand ready to help.

## U.S. Position on Evacuation of Foreign Forces From Burma

*Statements by Archibald J. Carey, Jr.  
U.S. Representative to the General Assembly<sup>1</sup>*

### REVIEW OF PROGRESS TOWARD AGREEMENT

U.S. delegation press release dated October 31

As we all know, the resolution<sup>2</sup> passed by the Seventh Assembly last April, by 59 votes with none against, recommended that the negotiations then in progress through the good offices of certain member states should be pursued toward a practical solution of the problem before us. On the basis of that resolution my Government suggested the formation of a working committee of the interested parties—that is, Burma, China, Thailand, and the United States—to recommend and supervise the implementation of measures for the evacuation of as many of the foreign forces from Burma as possible. The Committee was formed and began meeting at Bangkok on May 22.

Its efforts during the first month were productive. By June 22 the Committee had prepared a draft agreement on the principles of evacuation, as well as a preliminary plan for evacuation. Both documents were submitted to the Governments concerned for approval. Although the Four Power agreement on principles was not finally signed, for reasons beyond the control of the Committee, the four Governments have recently completed a full exchange of views and are now in accord on the measures to be taken. The evacuation plan, as subsequently developed and amplified by the Committee, was a practical one, and it is substantially this plan which is now being used.

Following the drafting of the agreement and the basic plan, the Committee's next step was to translate words into action. It was at this stage that serious obstacles were encountered. At the end of June five representative officers of the foreign forces from the Mōng Hsat area of Burma were called to Bangkok by the Committee to discuss ways and means of evacuation. The Committee's talks with these officers were unproductive and difficult. The Chinese Government made persistent efforts to persuade them to accept its stated policy of evacuation and even sent a special representative of Gen. Li Mi to Bangkok for this purpose, but difficulties with the Mōng Hsat officers continued and progress was halted for over a month, until early August. The Committee continued to press for a solution of the impasse until the Chinese Government called the leader of the foreign forces to Formosa for an explanation of

<sup>1</sup> Made on Oct. 31 and Nov. 4 in Committee I (Political and Security).

<sup>2</sup> U.N. doc. A/Resolution 101.

<sup>4</sup> For text of President Eisenhower's address at the dedication, see BULLETIN of Nov. 2, 1953, p. 579.



Chinese policy. When he returned to Bangkok on August 8, this leader was accompanied by Dr. Shao Yu-lin, President Chiang Kai-shek's special emissary, who went to Mōng Hsat further to explain his Government's desires to the Chinese troops in that area. On August 20 Dr. Shao was able to report some success. A considerable number of the troops had been influenced to agree to leave. But it became more and more evident that the Chinese Government, as it had already asserted, did in fact exercise only limited control over the large majority of the irregulars in Burma.

In the first week of September it appeared that Burma and China, and the troop commanders, were substantially agreed on the principles and mode of evacuation. The evacuation plan was ready except for one important detail, an estimate of the number of irregulars who would accept repatriation. Despite the urgings of the Committee, the Chinese Government felt itself unable to guarantee the departure of a specific number. On September 17, as you know, the Burmese made certain stipulations, including the removal of 5,000 men in 35 days, which the Chinese stated they were unable to accept; and Burma withdrew from the four-nation Committee.

But my Government continued its efforts to solve the problem. Having ascertained that the Chinese Government was still willing to evacuate as many troops as it could persuade to leave, the Governments of Thailand and the United States decided to continue their good offices with the Government of Burma, at the diplomatic level, in order to leave no stone unturned in the effort to reach a solution. The first step was to urge China to make concrete proposals as to what it was able and willing to do, and on September 30, the Chinese proposals were submitted to the remaining three-nation Committee at Bangkok. The Chinese Government stated that according to its information some 2,000 men and several hundred dependents could be evacuated. Among other things, China indicated willingness to disavow all irregulars refusing to leave Burma and gave assurances that it did not intend to aid these irregulars by furnishing them with supplies of any kind. At the first opportunity we transmitted these Chinese proposals to the Government of Burma; and we offered the continuance of our good offices, as well as our physical assistance with an evacuation, provided Burma would give reasonable assurances not to interfere with the operation or attack the evacuating troops.

I should add, as an indication of the importance which my Government has attached to a solution of this longstanding problem, that the President of the United States has taken a personal interest in it and has kept in close touch with developments.

After the Burmese representatives had left the four-nation Committee in mid-September, and before Burma's receipt of the Chinese proposals, the

Burmese Air Force had on several occasions bombed the Chinese installations in the Shan States. On October 13, however, the Burmese Government gave us its assurances that it would not interfere with an evacuation, would cooperate as far as possible with the Committee although not formally rejoining it, and would take no military action against the foreign forces before November 15. The Burmese Government at the same time indicated its willingness to send two teams of observers to cooperate in the execution of the evacuation plan. These Burmese assurances were contingent upon acceptance by the Chinese Government without delay. On October 21 our Embassy at Taipei reported that China had accepted the Burmese assurances. The acceptance was communicated to the Government of Burma with a minimum of delay, and that Government agreed that the cease-fire was in effect. This was in turn promptly communicated to the Chinese Government, and there was accord. On October 27 the Chinese representative at Bangkok told the Committee that the first group of evacuees would reach the Burma-Thai border by November 5. On October 29, as you know, the Committee at Bangkok issued the joint communique, which has been circulated in this Assembly, briefly recapitulating the scope of agreement as finally reached.<sup>a</sup>

It was only when agreement was a fact that the Governments of Thailand and the United States were able to set in motion the many arrangements which had been prepared. A contract was signed for the prearranged airlift from Thailand to Formosa. The United States Government, having sometime since selected and alerted its element of the international control team, ordered these officers to travel to Bangkok and report for duty. Burma arranged to send its team of observers.

The Government of Thailand, for its part, was able to activate final arrangements for the many facilities necessary for receiving the evacuees at the border and for their transit through Thai territory en route to Formosa. These arrangements include shelter, food, and medicaments for the evacuees, the dispatch of Thai security troops to the area, and a host of other services which only Thailand could provide. I wish to say here that, in my Government's view, no solution could have been possible without the wholehearted cooperation and hospitality of the Government of Thailand.

The necessary preparations, as you know, are taking several weeks. It is anticipated that movement of the first group of evacuees across the border may begin at about the end of the first week of November.

Mr. Chairman, my Government has already made it clear before this Assembly that it depletes

<sup>a</sup> U.N. doc. A/C. 1/L. 71.

the presence of unwanted foreign forces on the sovereign soil of Burma, and I now reiterate that view.

The Government of China, for its part, has openly declared its policy to be the removal of as many of the forces as possible. Such an evacuation is on the eve of being accomplished. It is our hope that additional personnel beyond the estimated 2,000 may be persuaded to quit Burma, and I am sure that everyone will agree that China should do everything within its power to increase that number. It has become manifest, however, that the degree of influence which the Chinese Government exercises over the large majority of these forces is small indeed. The Chinese Government, having recognized this, is repatriating what forces it can and is disavowing those who refuse to leave. As long as the latter refuse to acknowledge the authority of Burma, they are out-laws.

In the opinion of the United States Government, the removal of all the foreign forces who are amenable to the influence of the Chinese Government would constitute substantially the limit of what can be achieved by international action and peaceful methods. While regretting the continued presence of unwanted foreign forces on Burmese soil, my Government considers that it is not in the power of other Governments to secure their "complete evacuation" by peaceful means. It should be recalled that only a relatively small number of the forces formed the nucleus of regular Chinese Army personnel who retreated into Burma in 1950. The rest, according to the Chinese Government, are largely inhabitants of the Yunnan region who never had command relationship with that Government. Before this Assembly last April the representative of China pledged his Government's utmost cooperation in removing as many of these forces as could be prevailed upon to accept repatriation. This is now finally about to be accomplished, and in the opinion of my Government such accomplishment, when achieved, will constitute a substantial implementation of the resolution of April 23.

My Government does, however, wish it to be clearly understood that the interest of the United States in this problem will not cease with the evacuation of these several thousand troops. After this first movement we would hope to be able to consult again with the interested parties regarding what further action might usefully be taken.

In closing I should like to remark that in the exercise of our good offices we have striven unremittingly to carry out the intent of the resolution of April 23, insofar as this is within our power; and as long as the countries directly concerned continue to find our efforts helpful, the Government of the United States stands ready and willing to be of use.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

U.S. delegation press release dated November 4

In the interval which has elapsed since the press statement issued by the Joint Military Committee in Bangkok on October 29 was circulated to the members of this Committee, a number of developments bearing on the forthcoming evacuation of foreign troops in Burma have taken place which, I believe, will be of considerable interest to the members of this Committee and of which they should have knowledge in order properly to evaluate and assess actions already taken or which will shortly take place.

The information which I am making available comes from various official sources and to a considerable extent supplements the statement issued by the Joint Military Committee. Since the members of this Committee are doubtless familiar with the contents of the aforementioned statement, there is no need for me to dwell upon it, but I should like to repeat what I previously said about the agreement which has been reached, namely, that my Government considers it to be a substantial implementation of the resolution of April 23, and though it regrets the continued presence of unwanted foreign forces on Burmese soil, my Government considers that it is not in the power of other governments to secure the "complete evacuation of all of these troops by peaceful means."

The supplementary information to which I have alluded bears largely upon the implementation of the understandings outlined in the statement of October 29 and is as follows:

On October 28 American Embassy officials in Bangkok entered into a contract for the airlift to Taipei of the troops who are being evacuated from North Burma. The contract provides for the flight of these foreign forces from Lampang to Taipei nonstop at a rate not to exceed 200 per day. Each plane will carry approximately 50 evacuees.

The airlift will continue until such time as the evacuation committee is satisfied that all of the foreign troops and their dependents who have been persuaded to evacuate Burma have in fact departed.

The American Government, along with the Governments of China and Thailand, will defray part of the costs of the evacuation of foreign troops from Burma, the first of whom are expected to arrive at Tachilek on November 7. Four hundred evacuees are expected on that date, and an additional 150 on November 8; 100 on November 9; 100 on November 10; and additional numbers thereafter until approximately 2,000 will have been evacuated.

The Thai representative on the Joint Military Committee has stated that his country is prepared to receive the groups on the dates indicated.

The Burmese Government, as you are aware, has accepted the evacuation plan in principle and has

given assurances of full cooperation in facilitating the evacuation. In this connection a Burmese observer group, consisting of a major and five captains, proceeded to Bangkok on November 1 and is expected to accompany the Joint Military Committee and the United States, Thai, and Chinese evacuation teams to the north of Thailand on November 4. We have just received word that this group left Bangkok for the north of Thailand at 8:30 a. m. today, Thai time. These observers will be in a position fully to inform themselves regarding the progress of the evacuation.

Ten United States members of the American evacuation team arrived in Bangkok on October 30.

Tachilek will be the first staging point. This is a small village on the Thai-Burmese border about 170 miles north of Lampang. There the troops will be disarmed under the supervision of the military control teams operating under the direction of the Joint Evacuation Committee. The troops will then cross the border to Mae Sai in Thailand and be taken to a staging area at Mae Chan. From there they will be transported by truck and bus 150 miles to Lampang to board planes for Taipei.

All arrangements for handling the troops after their entrance into Thailand are being directed by the Thailand Government.

Before closing I should like once again to state that the interest of my country in this problem will not cease with the evacuation of the 2,000 troops and their dependents. After they have left Burmese soil, we would hope to be able again to consult with the interested parties regarding what further action might usefully be taken, and I can assure the members of this Committee that, as long as the countries directly concerned continue to find our efforts helpful, the Government of the United States stands ready and willing to be of use.<sup>4</sup>

## Urgent Need for U.N. Action on Freedom of Information

*Statement by Mrs. Oswald B. Lord  
U.S. Representative to the General Assembly<sup>5</sup>*

U.S. delegation press release dated November 4 [Excerpts]

In associating my Government with this resolution, I wish to take the opportunity to express my appreciation of the Report on Freedom of Information<sup>6</sup> prepared by Mr. Lopez.<sup>7</sup> The excellence of the report which the rapporteur has pre-

<sup>4</sup> On Nov. 5 Committee I by a vote of 50-3-0 deferred debate on the Burmese complaint for 3 weeks.

<sup>5</sup> Made on Nov. 4 in Committee III (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural).

<sup>6</sup> U.N. doc. E/2426.

<sup>7</sup> Salvador Lopez of the Philippines.

## Text of Draft Resolution on Freedom of Information<sup>1</sup>

U.N. doc. A/C.3/L.364  
Dated Oct. 28, 1953

*The General Assembly,*

Recalling that, in resolutions 631 (VII) and 633 (VII), it requested the Economic and Social Council to submit to the General Assembly at its eighth session a statement of its views and plans regarding future work in connexion with freedom of information and its recommendations concerning the development of information facilities in underdeveloped regions of the world,

Regretting that the Economic and Social Council was unable to give consideration at its sixteenth session to the subject of freedom of information, including the Report of its Rapporteur (E/2426),

1. Requests the Economic and Social Council to give priority at its seventeenth session to discussion of freedom of information, including the Report of the Rapporteur, and to the formulation of recommendations for the consideration of the General Assembly at its ninth session;

2. Requests the Economic and Social Council, in its discussion of freedom of information, to take into account the views expressed on this subject at the eighth session of the General Assembly; and

3. Requests the Secretary-General to complete the report on a programme of concrete action for the development of information facilities in underdeveloped regions in the world, requested in resolution 633 (VII), in time for consideration at the seventeenth session of the Economic and Social Council.

<sup>1</sup> Sponsored by Chile, France, Mexico, the Netherlands, Pakistan, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Uruguay. Committee III approved the resolution as amended (A/C.3/L.379) on Nov. 5 by a vote of 42-0-6; the vote in the Assembly on Nov. 28 was 53-0-6 (Soviet bloc).

pared is no surprise to any of us who know Mr. Lopez, who is one of our most valued colleagues.

It is regrettable that the Economic and Social Council was unable to discuss the report at its last session. We find it equally unfortunate that the Secretary-General likewise has not been able to complete his report on freedom of information for the consideration of this body and venture to express the hope that it will not be unduly delayed.

I believe I am on safe grounds in stating that the views of my Government on the general subject of freedom of information are well known in this forum and elsewhere. As all of you know, freedom of the press, speech, and assembly are in the bedrock of the Constitution of the United States and have become so much a part of the American way of life that many of us are prone to take these freedoms for granted. This, however, seldom lasts for long, because there are almost daily reminders in many parts of the world that these priceless freedoms cannot ever be taken for granted. For example, I noticed in the news columns only last week that the editor of a newspaper in a certain foreign land had been arrested because he had dared to write an article critical of the head of his



country; while only a few days ago another government announced that it had taken over the publication of a newspaper which it had confiscated for expressing views distasteful to those in power. It is unhappy events such as these, which I venture to say occur in some part of the world almost daily, that give us pause in our complacency. As we all know, large parts of the world do not now have a truly free press.

Our delegation will have a number of recommendations to propose to the Economic and Social Council concerning the Lopez report. We hope that the consideration of this report will go far toward solving some of our knottier problems of freedom of information throughout the world.

For example, Mr. Lopez recommends that an annual report or survey be made by the United Nations of the global status of freedom of information, in order that restrictions and other excesses against such freedom may be brought into the salutary light of world opinion. This is fully in line with our own views, expressed by the U. S. delegate in the Economic and Social Council last year, that a yearly report be made on this subject, together with recommendations for reducing or eliminating repressions and violations. We believe this particular recommendation can be broadened to include many other aspects of the subject. It could, for instance, bring together various studies and the holding of a major debate in the Economic and Social Council at periodic intervals on freedom of information. Since, however, the Lopez report is not now before this body, we offer these as purely tentative views at this stage. We do so solely to underline the emphasis we wish to place on making some progress in freedom of information and we reserve the right to change or expand them at the proper time.

Another of Mr. Lopez' suggestions which we feel to have great merit is that a rapporteur be appointed for another year to continue the work he has begun with such promise. My Government made the original proposal for the appointment of a rapporteur on freedom of information and believes that his work can be broadened and strengthened if he is allowed to continue for another full year. This would be compatible with our own previously expressed views that the United Nations agencies should do everything possible to keep under constant study and review the issue of freedom of information in order to expose violations and seek appropriate remedies.

In cosponsoring this resolution on freedom of information, I wish to emphasize that it would request the next session of the Economic and Social Council to discuss on an urgent basis the Report of the Rapporteur on Freedom of Information and formulate recommendations for the consideration of the Ninth Session of the General Assembly.

Turning now to the draft resolution contained in document L. 364, may I say that our delegation joined in sponsoring this draft resolution because of the deep concern that the United States Government and the American press have in safeguarding freedom of information.

The United States delegation feels that the Council should be requested to give priority attention to the subject of freedom of information and that the Secretary-General should complete the study of concrete action for developing information media in underdeveloped countries. The adoption of this draft resolution will not commit any Government regarding the conclusions and recommendations of the rapporteur's report; and my Government, like others, will make known its views about those substantive issues in greater detail in the Council. The adoption of this resolution will merely insure that the Council will devote ample attention at its next session to one of the most important items on its agenda.

## **U.S. Delegations to International Conferences**

### **Commission for Bibliography and Publications (WMO)**

The Department of State announced on November 18 (press release 629) that the United States will participate in the First Session of the Commission for Bibliography and Publications of the World Meteorological Organization (Wmo) scheduled to be held at Paris from November 24 to December 14, 1953. The U. S. delegate will be Arthur W. Johnson, Meteorological Attaché, Geneva.

### **IMC Central Group on "Stand-by" Basis**

The International Materials Conference announced on October 26 that the Central Group of the Conference had gone on a "stand-by" basis, effective October 23. Such action followed the dissolution of the last active Commodity Committee (Manganese-Nickel-Cobalt) on September 30.

During the last 2½ years, the Central Group has held regular monthly meetings to discuss matters of general interest and to make the necessary arrangements for the work of the Conference. On its "stand-by" basis the Central Group will no longer meet regularly. There will, however, be a meeting on or before December 15. The purpose and function of the Central Group in its "stand-by" character are to provide a meeting point at an international level for the discussion of common problems arising out of possible shortages of raw materials and to furnish an instru-

ment for the speedy recalling of specialized groups should new emergencies arise.

The expenses of the Conference have been met by contributions from the participating governments. Owing to the progressive reduction in the activities of the Conference in the last 12 months, certain funds remain unspent. These are now being refunded to the contributing governments.

A final report, supplementing the two previous reports on operations issued in April 1952 and April 1953 and reviewing briefly the activities of the Conference in the last 7 months, has been prepared and will be issued in November.

## Current U. N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography<sup>1</sup>

### General Assembly

Budget Estimates for the Financial Year 1954. Statement by the Secretary-General Before the Fifth Committee, 30 September 1953. A/C.5/544/Rev. 1, Oct. 5, 1953. 10 pp. mimeo.

Permanent Missions to the United Nations. Report of the Secretary-General. A/2496, Oct. 6, 1953. 3 pp. mimeo.

The Tunisian Question. The Question of Morocco. Letter dated 7 October 1953 from the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Chairman of the French delegation, to the Chairman of the First Committee. A/C.1/L.58, Oct. 7, 1953. 1 p. mimeo.

Audit Reports Relating to Expenditure by Specialized Agencies of Technical Assistance Funds Allocated from the Special Account. Note by the Secretary-General. A/C.5/546, Oct. 7, 1953. 20 pp. mimeo.

Budget Estimates for the Financial Year 1954. Section 32. The International Court of Justice. Fourth report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to the eighth session of the General Assembly. A/2499, Oct. 8, 1953. 3 pp. mimeo.

Question of South West Africa. Addendum to the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on South West Africa. A/2475/Add. 1, Oct. 8, 1953. 3 pp. mimeo.

The Korean Question. Note by the Secretary-General covering a communication dated Oct. 5, 1953 from the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, transmitting maps entitled "Armistice Agreement, Volume II, Maps." A/2431/Add. 1, Oct. 8, 1953. 2 pp. mimeo.

Transfer to the United Nations of functions and powers exercised by the League of Nations under the slavery convention of 25 September 1926: Draft protocol prepared by the Secretary-General (A/2435). United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

<sup>1</sup> Printed materials may be secured in the United States from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y. Other materials (mimeographed or processed documents) may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

The United Nations Secretariat has established an Official Records series for the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and the Atomic Energy Commission, which includes summaries of proceedings, resolutions, and reports of the various commissions and committees. Information on securing subscriptions to the series may be obtained from the International Documents Service.

Draft Resolution. A/C.6/L.304. Oct. 10, 1953. 4 pp. mimeo.

Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance for the Economic Development of Under-Developed Countries: Report of the Economic and Social Council. Report of the Working Group. A/C.2/L.202, Oct. 9, 1953. 4 pp. mimeo.

Peace Observation Commission. Balkans Sub-Commission. Seventh Periodic Report of the United Nations Military Observers in Greece. A/CN.7/SC.1/51, Oct. 14, 1953. 5 pp. mimeo.

Invitation to non-member states to become parties to the convention on the political rights of women. Report of the Sixth Committee. A/2508, Oct. 13, 1953. 2 pp. mimeo.

Appeal to states to accelerate their ratifications of, or accessions to, the convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide, and measures designed to ensure the widest possible diffusion of the nature, contents and purposes of the convention. Report of the Sixth Committee. A/2507, Oct. 13, 1953. 3 pp. mimeo.

Non-Self-Governing Territories. Factors which should be taken into account in deciding whether a territory is or is not a territory whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government. Text of the draft resolution adopted by the Committee at its 330th meeting on 9 October 1953. A/C.4/L.270, Oct. 14, 1953. 6 pp. mimeo.

## THE FOREIGN SERVICE

### Assignments

The Department announced on November 17 (press release 620) that W. Walton Butterworth, now Ambassador to Sweden, is being assigned to London as Minister and Deputy Chief of Mission and that Julius C. Holmes, who has served as Minister and Deputy Chief of Mission in London for the past 5 years, is undertaking a temporary assignment in the Department in relation to Trieste.

### Consular Offices

The official closing of the consulate at Bari, Italy, took place on October 13. The Usis office at Bari closed to the public on September 15 and closed officially on September 30.

The official closing of the consulate at Málaga, Spain, took place on October 28. Effective October 29, a consular agency was established at Málaga.

The official closing date of the consulate at Brisbane, Queensland, Australia, was September 22. Consular jurisdiction for the Brisbane area was assumed by the consulate general at Sydney as of August 15.

Following is a list of additional consulates which have been closed:

	Closed to public	Officially closed
Adelaide, Australia . . .	May 30, 1953	June 15, 1953
Georgetown		
British Gulana . . .	Nov. 28, 1952	Dec. 14, 1952
Gibraltar . . . . .	July 15, 1953	Sept. 9, 1953
Godthaab, Greenland . .	Aug. 15, 1953	Oct. 9, 1953
Newcastle-on-Tyne		
England . . . . .	Sept. 11, 1953	Oct. 7, 1953
Regina, Canada . . .	Aug. 31, 1953	Oct. 2, 1953
Tenerife, Canary Islands . . . . .	July 17, 1953	Oct. 4, 1953

**Africa**  
EGYPT: Claims against former ruling family of Egypt . . . . . 750

**American Principles**  
the moral initiative (Dulles) . . . . . 741

**American Republics**  
claims payment made by Mexico . . . . . 750  
importance of U.S.-Latin American trade (Cabot) . . . . . 751

**Asia**  
AFGHANISTAN: Letter of credence . . . . . 740  
BURMA: U.S. position on evacuation of foreign forces from Burma (Carey) . . . . . 761

**KOREA:**  
Freeing prisoners of war in Korea (Dulles) . . . . . 749  
Inclusion of atrocities item on General Assembly agenda (Lodge) . . . . . 757  
U.S. objective in discussion of "germ warfare" charges (Ford) . . . . . 758

**Bacteriological Warfare**  
U.S. objective in discussion of "germ warfare" charges (Ford) . . . . . 758

**Canada**  
the Canadian-American partnership (Eisenhower address; joint communique; documents) . . . . . 735

**Claims and Property**  
claims against former ruling family of Egypt . . . . . 750

**Communism**  
the moral initiative (Dulles) . . . . . 741

**Congress**  
import duties on briber pipes (Eisenhower) . . . . . 754

**Economics**  
the Canadian-American partnership (Eisenhower address; joint communique; documents) . . . . . 735  
Eric Johnston reports on Near East talks . . . . . 749  
importance of U.S.-Latin American trade (Cabot) . . . . . 751

**Europe**  
Three power conference scheduled . . . . . 740  
U.S.S.R.:  
Anniversary of recognition of Soviet Government (Dulles) . . . . . 749  
Invitation to four-power meeting left open (U.S.-U.S.S.R. notes) . . . . . 745

**Finance**  
Claims payment made by Mexico . . . . . 750

**Foreign Service**  
Appointments (Butterworth, Holmes) . . . . . 766  
Consular offices . . . . . 766

**International Information**  
Mission of USIA defined (Eisenhower, Streibert) . . . . . 756

**International Meetings**  
IMC central group on "stand-by" basis . . . . . 765  
Three power conference scheduled . . . . . 740  
U.S. DELEGATION: Commission for bibliography and publications (Wmo) . . . . . 765

**Near and Middle East**  
Continuation of assistance to Arab refugees (Richards) . . . . . 759  
Eric Johnston reports on Near East talks . . . . . 749

**Presidential Documents**  
The Canadian-American partnership (Eisenhower address; joint communique; documents) . . . . . 735  
Import duties on briber pipes (Eisenhower) . . . . . 754

**Prisoners of War**  
Freeing prisoners of war in Korea (Dulles) . . . . . 749  
Inclusion of atrocities item on General Assembly agenda (Lodge) . . . . . 757

**Refugees and Displaced Persons**  
Continuation of assistance to Arab refugees (Richards) . . . . . 759

**Strategic Materials**  
IMC central group on "stand-by" basis . . . . . 765

**Trade**  
Import duties on briber pipes (Eisenhower) . . . . . 754

**United Nations**  
**GENERAL ASSEMBLY:**  
Continuation of assistance to Arab refugees (Richards) . . . . . 759  
Inclusion of atrocities item on General Assembly agenda (Lodge) . . . . . 757  
U.S. objective in discussion of "germ warfare" charges (Ford) . . . . . 758  
U.S. position on evacuation of foreign forces from Burma (Carey) . . . . . 761  
Current U.N. documents: A selected bibliography . . . . . 766  
Urgent need for U.N. action on freedom of information (Lord; text of resolution) . . . . . 764

**Name Index**

Butterworth, W. Walton . . . . . 766  
Cabot, John M. . . . . 751  
Carey, Archibald J., Jr. . . . . 761  
Dulles, Secretary . . . . . 741, 749, 750  
Eisenhower, President . . . . . 735, 754, 756  
Ford, Henry II . . . . . 758  
Holmes, Julius C. . . . . 766  
Johnston, Eric . . . . . 749  
Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr. . . . . 757  
Lord, Mrs. Oswald B. . . . . 764  
Ludin, Mohammad Kabir . . . . . 740  
Richards, James P. . . . . 759  
St. Laurent, Prime Minister Louis S. . . . . 735  
Streibert, Theodore C. . . . . 756

**Check List of Department of State  
Press Releases: November 16-20, 1953**

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.  
Press release issued prior to November 16 which appears in this issue of the BULLETIN is No. 616 of November 12.

No.	Date	Subject
618	11/16	Reply to Soviet note of Nov. 3
619	11/17	Claims against former Egyptian rulers
620	11/17	Butterworth, Holmes assignments
621	11/17	Dulles: Repatriation of POW's
622	11/17	Dulles: Recognition of Soviet regime
623	11/17	Dulles: Eric Johnston's trip
624	11/17	Dulles: The moral initiative
625	11/18	Exchange of persons
626	11/18	Murphy: The U.S. and the U.N.
627	11/18	New munitions list
628	11/18	Exchange of persons
629	11/18	Delegate to WMO meeting
630	11/19	Afghan credentials (re-write)
631	11/19	Mexican payment on claims
632	11/20	Visa agreement with Mexico

\*Not printed.  
†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.





the  
Department  
of  
State

*Order Form*

To: Supt. of Documents  
Govt. Printing Office  
Washington 25, D.C.

*Enclosed And:*

\$.....  
(cash, check, or  
money order).

## The BACKGROUND

### Pamphlets . . . *brief* . . . *pertinent* . . . *readable*

Background pamphlets are official summaries of the problems which confront U.S. foreign policy. They give background information—the essential factors and conditions which determine U.S. actions in international affairs. Each is a concise and timely roundup of an issue or area of immediate concern. For an added perspective, read the Background series.

Some of the Backgrounds now available . . .

INDIA: A PATTERN FOR DEMOCRACY  
IN ASIA . . . . . Pub. 5095. 10¢

MALAYA: TROUBLE SPOT IN SOUTH-  
EAST ASIA . . . . . Pub. 5061. 10¢

INDOCHINA: THE WAR IN VIET-NAM,  
CAMBODIA, AND LAOS . . . . . Pub. 5092. 5¢

PAKISTAN: FAITH BUILDS A NEW  
FORCE IN ASIA . . . . . Pub. 4977. 5¢

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

Would you like to be notified when new Backgrounds are issued? Fill out and return the coupon below.

N 77

Please send me the Backgrounds indicated below (specify no. of copies):

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
☐ Please notify me  
when new Back-  
grounds are issued.

Name -----

Street address -----

City, Zone, and State -----

